THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

FEBRUARY
1920

THE ALBANY SUSPENSION

A Symposium

LENOX AVENUE EXPRESS

Louis Untermeyer

THE BELGIAN ELECTIONS

Emile Vandervelde

THE CZAR'S POLICE

HUNGARY UNDER BELA KUN

EUROPE'S FINANCIAL CHAOS

THE NEGRO IN INDUSTRY

HAS LIBERALISM FAILED?

VICTOR L. BERGER

Contents

LENOX AVENUE EXPRESS
Louis Untermeyer .....Page 129
MAKING DEMOCRACY SAFE
Frederick F. Rockwell.....Page 130
EUROPE'S FINANCIAL CHAOS
F. W. Pethick-Lawrence...Page 133
THE BELGIAN ELECTIONS
Emile Vandervelde .....Page 136
THE CZAR'S POLICE
Isaac A. Hourwich.....Page 138
HAS LIBERALISM FAILED?
S. E. .....Page 142
HUNGARY UNDER BELA KUN
Alice Riggs Hunt.....Page 145
EDITORIAL NOTES
Seeing Red. W. H. C.....Page 151
Victor L. Berger. H. W. L..Page 156
THE COMMITTEE OF FORTY-EIGHT
John Haynes Holmes.....Page 160
IN NORTH DAKOTA
A. B. Gilbert.....Page 162
CHANGING CONCEPTIONS OF THE STATE
Jessie Wallace Hughan....Page 165
THE NEGRO IN INDUSTRY
Herbert J. Seligmann.....Page 169
GUILD SOCIALISM
Harry W. Laidler.....Page 173
SUSPENSION OF THE ASSEMBLYMEN
A Symposium.....Page 176
THE I. S. S. CONVENTION...Page 185
THE COLLEGIAN IN THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT .....Page 187
BOOK REVIEWS
Forerunners. Rolland ....Page 189
A Levy on Capital. Pethick-Lawrence .....Page 190
Organizing for Work. Gantt .....Page 191

Our Contributors

W. HARRIS CROOK, M.A. Managing Editor of *The Socialist Review,* former editor of the Boston *Forward.*

BABETTE DEUTSCH. Author of "Banners."

S. E. Professor in an American college.

LEWIS STYLES GANNETT. Journalist recently returned from France and Germany; represented *The Survey* at the Peace Conference.

A. B. GILBERT. Associate editor *The Nonpartisan Leader,* author of "American Cities."

FELIX GRENDON. Author of "Nixola of Wall Street."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES. Minister of the Community Church, New York, member of the General Committee of the *Committee of Forty-Eight,* author of "New Wars for Old," "The Revolutionary Function of the Modern Church."

JESSIE W. HUGHAN, Ph.D. Author of "American Socialism of the Present Day," "Facts of Socialism."

ISAAC A. HOURWICH, Ph.D. Author of "Immigration and Labor," "The Economics of the Russian Village," statistician for the Russian Soviet Bureau.

ALICE RIGGS HUNT. Special Correspondent at the Paris Conference for the *New York Evening Post.*

HARRY W. LAIDLER, Ph.D. Editor of *The Socialist Review,* author of "Boycotts and the Labor Struggle."

F. W. PETHICK-LAWRENCE, M.A. Author of "A Levy on Capital," barrister-at-law, former Treasurer of the Union for Democratic Control of Great Britain, member of the Independent Labor Party.

FREDERICK F. ROCKWELL. Horticultural editor of a farm magazine.

HERBERT J. SELIGMANN. Contributor on the race question to *The New Republic, The Nation,* and other periodicals.

LOUIS UNTERMEYER. Author of "The Challenge," "Including Horace."

EMILE VANDERVELDE. Minister of Justice in the Belgian Coalition Government, formerly Chairman of the International Socialist Bureau, leader of Belgian Labor Party, author of "Collectivism," "The State vs. Socialism."

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. VIII. FEBRUARY 1920 No. 3

Lenox Avenue Express

Louis Untermeyer

Seated or hanging from the straps, they sway,
  Heated and limp as though some old disease
Prodded them on and sucked their strength away.
  God! Am I dying for these?

Faces gone blank except for grovelling lusts;
  Trace of the beast caught in some black abyss.
There the strong hopes are snapped and iron rusts.
  Where is the promise in this?

Barter and bed—and for your worthless schemes
  Martyrs have bled; armies have split in two;
Dreamers have sacrificed all but their dreams.
  Christs have been tortured for you.

Answer! Defend yourselves! Or will this deep
  Cancer of apathy consume you all?
Have races died to make a world for sheep
  Craving no more than a stall?

Are you too soft? Or do remembered pains
  Bar you from thrilling with the blood they gave?
Go—there is nought to lose except your chains.
  Know what it is to be brave!

Making Democracy Safe

Frederick F. Rockwell

" 'Twas a narrow escape we had that time, Tim," exclaimed Mr. O'Malley, putting down his shoemaker's wax and fitting another sole.

"A narrow eschape indade—me har-rit jumps like th' price of good liquor just to think iv it."

"To think iv what, Shaemus?" inquired Mr. Donnegan, blowing a puff of smoke toward the shoe laden counter, "d'ye mean th' day th' wor-rld was comin' to an end?"

"Worse than that, me friend. 'Tis little ye realize, settin' there at yer ease, at th' cool end iv a good segar-r, how near we've all been to th' brink iv ruin, chaos, red revolution—and a serious disturbance iv th' proper perspective between Labor and Capital, as Father Hogan would say."

"I tell ye, Donnegan, th' Czar iv all th' Russias—we never used to realize how many Russias there are!—th' Czar at the height iv his glory never had more excitin' times than we're havin' right now.

"An' I tell ye too, Donnegan, if there's any wan thing that makes a man proud that he's an American, its th' way some iv our leadin' citizens will rush into the breeches an' save th' day, when the existence iv this fair and free land iv ours is really threatened.

"It has always been so. Th' emergency in 1776 projuced its Washington; th' emergency iv 1861 projuced its Lincoln; and the emergency iv 1920 has projuced its Thaddeus C. Sweet! An' be th' grace iv God, and th' help of Senator Lusk—once again have our glorious institoochuns been snatched fr'm th' brink iv dissolution and saved inviolate—Liberty *and* Union, now and *forever,* one and *inseparable!"*

"Ye sound, O'Malley," ventured Mr. Donnegan, reaching into his pocket, "like another 'drive' iv some sort—how much d'ye want this time?"

" 'Tis nawthin' I'm wantin' but intilligent attention—and that ye'r wantin' yourself," returned Mr. O'Malley, between the nails held in his lips.

"Th' fact that ye don't know what I'm talkin' about, is only anither proof iv how insidjusly these terrible socialists have been goin' about their task iv overturnin' th' governmint. Ye are only wan iv millions, Tim, who never knew there was any real socialist movement in these United States, until Thaddeus C. Sweet pulled aside the curtain iv secrecy they've hid themselves behind all these years, and ravaled them, bombs and blundebusses in hand, in the very act iv blowin' up the Federal government at Albany, and also the branch office at Washington. He showed thim, about to seize th' reins iv political power, to step on th' gas, and dhrive the ship iv State into the deserts iv industrial ruin, and the morass iv moral disintegration!

"Just think iv it, Tim. Here f'r

years th' Socialist Party iv America, right under our very eyes, has been holdin' conventions, and nominatin' candidates, and electin' representatives, and doin' it all so secretly that not even th' police or th' secret service ever had a suspicion iv it! 'Tis almost incredible!

"Iv course, here and there 'twas accidentally discovered that there was a Socialist Party, and members belongin' to it. But th' socialist leaders, financed be th' bankrupt governmint iv Lenine and Trotzky, cleverly bought up th' big metropolitan papers to say nawthin' much about it. *And be a very clever rouse, they even had most iv their own papers suppressed. so the news wouldn't leak out that way!*

" 'Tis doubtful if the damnable plot would have been discovered in time, if it hadn't ben for th' energetic and pathriotic services iv th' Lusk Committee, assisted be that peerless protector iv personal liberty, Archie Stevenson. 'Tis as thrilling a tale, Donnegan, as any iv th' stories ye used to read in Old Sleuth and Nick Carter, about Roosian Nihilists. In some of th' raids they made, th' Lusk Committee came into possession of evidence which, after careful study be experts, led them to believe that there was at least one, possibly more socialists *in the Assembly at Albany!* Quick but careful investigation revaled th' startling fact that *five* socialists had been elected to the Assembly, and that four iv them had been there before! Also that th' Socialist Party had adopted a platform which, though they had been running on it for more than two years, was not yet worn out! That in itself was proof enough that th' Socialist Party *is not a political party!* And not being a political party, how c'ud it legally sind politicians to Albany? And if those that were sint were not politicians—what business did they have there anyway?

"Moreover, th' representatives iv th' Socialist Party were bound be their sacred promise to continue to represent th' wishes iv their constituents *after* being elected! That in itself smelled iv *Revolution.* Furthermore, here was proof that these five men were mentally incapacitated. F'r what man in his right mind would think iv expectin' to serve *after* election th' interests of th' constituents, instead of serving the constituents iv th' Interests?

"Tim, a great man is often known be recognizing a great crisis when it hits him. So Thaddeus Sweet recognized there was not a moment to lose, if he was to save th' country! He got th' gang togither.

" 'Boys,' says he, 'we're faced not only by a theory, but also be a fact. Five socialists, duly elected, some iv thim over fusion candidates and in spite iv every good Democratic and Raypublican method that c'ud be used to save th' election from thim! Five iv thim stand ready to claim seats in this august body. Moreover, once seated, they'll stick around most iv the time; and there's business to be done we c'ud do much more convaniently without thim. The only

thing I see to do with them is to do *without thim!'*

"'Gentlemen,' says Senator Lusk, 'I have here evidence to prove that these five men are unalterably opposed to government of the people, by us people, for some people, and that they are ready to attempt an immegiate overthrow iv our government. They have planned to disguise thimselves as captains iv industry, go down to Washington, gain admittance to the Presidential Mansion, and there lave th' water runnin' in the bathroom, so that th' White House will float down into th' Susquehanah! Thin, with the entire national administration being carried out to sea, these terrorists will appoint themselves secretary iv th' Army, th' Navy, th' Treasury, Labor and Agriculture and perceed with the Revo-o-o-olution! Was there ever a more dastardly plot against our fair counthry's pease, prosperity, property an' profit?'

"'But, Gentlemen'—'tis Thaddeus C. Sweet agin speakin', Tim—'this dastardly plot shall never machure, not while there's wan breath left in this poor frail body iv mine to prevent it. Gentlemen, we can save the State and the Nation—an' th' rights iv property. We can; we shall; we must—or we'll lose our jobs! We must save Represintative Governmint and th' Ship iv State from th' hands iv these inthruders,' he says, 'even if we have to scuttle th' ship to do it!'

"An' Tim, that's what they did. Whin th' legislature convened, Shpeaker Sweet, with th' sweat standin' out on his noble brow, as Mercy and Justice sthruggled in his mind against Pathriotism and Jooty, summoned these five socialists before the bar.

"'You men,' says he, 'come here askin' f'r seats in this body——'

"'We do not,' says wan iv them. 'We were *sint here* be a majority iv th' voters in——'

"'Silence!' thunders Thaddeus C. Sweet. 'Ye'll have an opporchunity to be heard—after ye've been convicted,' he says.

"'Ye have expressed sympathy f'r the Bolsheviks; ye have kept good Raypublicans and Democrats out iv this Assembly; be so doin', ye threaten th' best interests iv th' State and Counthry. Besides, I don't like ye'r looks. *Ye are suspended!* But ye will have a fair and impartial thrial. Assemblyman Lynchem, who belaves no socialist should be allowed to hold any office anywhere, under any conditions, will see to that. Sergant-at-ar-rms, ye will show this bunch iv criminals th' door!'

"I tell ye, Tim, 'twas a courageous thing to do. Wan iv thim might have had a bomb in his pocket at that momint!"

"*I* think," said Donnegan, "that th' names iv Thaddeus C. Sweet and Senator Lusk will go down in political history."

"They will," agreed Mr. O'Malley, "an' be th' comments in most iv th' papers, they'll go down with a sickenin' thud!"

Europe's Financial Chaos

F. W. Pethick-Lawrence

It is sometimes stated both in America and in England that as a consequence of the war Europe as a whole is bankrupt. To anyone who knows the facts such a statement is utterly ridiculous. Europe is not bankrupt and is not nearly bankrupt. Its wealth today is prodigious and its liabilities are only a tiny part—well under five per cent.—of this wealth.

I do not expect this assertion to be readily believed. On the contrary, I hope it will be immediately called into question in the light of the known facts about national debts, American loans, falling exchanges, rising prices, and famished peoples.

Let us proceed at once to review these facts one at a time. The national debt of Britain alone is about forty billion dollars, that of France is only a little less, and that of Germany (exclusive of the indemnity) about the same. When the national debts of Russia, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, and the small nations are added in a total, not far short of two hundred billion dollars is reached. Is it possible, it will be asked, that the aggregate wealth of these countries, depleted as it must be owing to the war, is still so great that two hundred billion dollars is less than five per cent. of it? It certainly is not. The aggregate wealth of Europe before the war was reckoned by Dr. Stamp, a noted British statistician, at about three hundred and sixty billion dollars, which would be equivalent to about five hundred billion dollars in post-war prices, so that allowing for the destruction wrought by the war, the present gross wealth of Europe may be placed at about four hundred billion dollars. Of this figure two hundred billion dollars—the aggregate national debts—form not five but fifty per cent.

The Debt to Citizens

But the criterion proposed is really unsound. A "National" debt is not, in spite of its name, a debt owed by a nation as a whole to foreigners. Only a small part of it is actually this. The rest is simply a bookkeeping transaction between the citizens of the country itself. It is a promise made on behalf of the citizens as a whole to recoup certain of their own number who lent money during the war. When, therefore, the position of any one country as a whole is being considered with a view to bankruptcy, only that part of the debt which is owed to foreigners ought to be taken into account; that part which is owed to its own citizens does not affect the question.

In order to make this point clearer it may be illustrated by the case of Britain. The British "National" debt is today about forty billion dollars. Of this, about eight billion is owed to the American government and to American individuals and oth-

er foreigners. The remaining thirty-two billion dollars is owed to British citizens and merely affects the internal distribution of wealth within the country. The real wealth of the country—its lands, its houses, its factories, its ships, its mines, its railways, —are still in existence, and are reckoned to be worth about seventy billion dollars. Apart, therefore, from the fact that Britain is a creditor of foreign countries, to the amount of many billions of dollars, there is no question of her bankruptcy, for her total indebtedness to other nations is a tiny fraction of her wealth.

Somewhat similar reasoning, though in a modified form, applies to Europe as a whole. Europe is not and cannot be bankrupt in consequence of the debts owed by European governments to their own peoples or even to one another. She might conceivably be bankrupt if the net debt she owed to America and other continents exceeded the wealth within her own lands. But this is certainly not the case today. The net external debt of Europe is probably less than twenty billion dollars, i. e., is less than five per cent. of her real wealth which I have reckoned above at four hundred billion dollars.

Expenditures and Taxation

But if Europe is not bankrupt, why are exchanges falling and prices rising? The answer is simple. Europe is today greatly overspending its income. This is partly the inevitable after-result of war, which depleted almost to zero all available supplies of food and raw materials, but is mainly due to the policy of most of the European governments. These governments are still continuing to spend vast sums on military enterprises outside their borders and they are still refusing to tax their peoples either to pay for these enterprises or even to meet the normal post-war expenditure of their countries. Thus Britain is raising a revenue of five billion dollars against an expenditure of seven billion dollars; France is raising some two billion dollars against an outlay of four and one-half billion dollars. So long as this profligate policy is continued the natural laws of economics and finance will cause the exchanges to fall and prices to rise and the peoples to be impoverished.

Drift

Sooner or later reality will have to be faced. The budgets will have to be made to meet. But how? That is the problem which is agitating to its foundations every country in Europe. The existing reactionary governments would like to throw the burden of increased taxation on the backs of the working people as has been done hitherto after all the great wars of history. If this could be repeated today all those who have grown rich out of the war would be able to live in splendor on the fortunes they have made. But the governments know that such a proposal would provoke a revolution and they dare not put it forward. The only other effective policy is to tax the rich and tax them adequately by means of a capital levy

or otherwise; this they are unwilling to adopt. And therefore they do nothing and allow things to drift from bad to worse.

Breakdown of System

Closely allied to this failure of the European governments to balance their budgets is the breakdown of the existing organization of society in the provision and maintenance of the necessary public utilities. The supply of houses is utterly inadequate and grows worse every day. Yet, certainly in England, and I believe in other countries also, scarcely any houses are being built. It does not pay to build them! Millions of people are grossly overcrowded, hundreds of thousands of workmen are idle and would be employable in the building trades, materials are available, but nothing is actually done!

Again, the railway system in England and elsewhere falls between the two stools of private ownership and national control, and while a yearly deficit is registered which has to be met from the public exchequer, the wages of the workers are such as to keep them and their families below the line of physical efficiency. Finally, over great tracts of Europe tens of thousands of the poorer classes are dying and millions are suffering acutely from famine and shortage of clothing and fuel.

All these problems and many others with which there is not space to deal have their roots in finance. In their aggregate they constitute the financial chaos of Europe, a condition from which somehow the peoples of Europe must extricate themselves if they would survive. The wealth is there, the means of production are there, the need is supreme, but the industrial machine creaks and groans and in many cases refuses to function at all.

Everywhere men and women are therefore asking themselves whether the whole basis of the existing order of society does not need to be reorganized. They are wondering whether a new system cannot be found in which the opportunities of life shall be less unequal, in which the great mass of the people shall share more justly in the fruits of their labors and in which supply shall adequately keep pace with the legitimate needs of the whole of mankind. It may be that they are wrong. But if so, the champions of the existing order need to bestir themselves in order to obtain from it results very different from those which it is yielding at the present time.

To Our Readers

Owing to the Albany suspension our columns are more than usually crowded this month (e. g. with the Symposium), and we are compelled to hold over till the March issue our regular feature, The Socialist Review Calendar. Next month will also contain a quarterly review of important magazine articles.

We again appeal to our readers to keep us promptly informed of any change of address, as we cannot otherwise be responsible for their copies.

The Belgian Elections

Emile Vandervelde

Before the war the Belgian Parliament was composed of two chambers, both of them elected by the plural vote; one vote for poor men and two or three votes for the well-to-do. At twenty-five years one could vote for the Chamber of Representatives, at thirty years for the Senate, composed of eligible persons drawing a large income, or of members elected at a second stage by the provincial boards.

For twenty-five years the Labor Party (socialist) had fought unceasingly for the abolition of the plural vote, and for the suppression, or at least the democratization, of the Senate. But the war was necessary to bring about the desired results.

The Socialist Increase

Following the liberation of the country the most enlightened of the conservatives had to recognize that it was morally impossible any longer to treat as inferior citizens the workers of Belgium who had so powerfully aided the defense of the country. The coalition government, which was formed after the armistice, put through the Chambers—still not without opposition from the stubborn—an exceptional electoral law declaring that election to the Chambers charged with the revision of the constitution would be by universal suffrage of men over twenty-one years of age. These elections were held on November 16, 1919.

They brought about for the Senate the downfall of the conservative (Clerical) party which had been in power for thirty-five years. The Chamber, which constitutes the principal assembly in Belgium, before the last election was composed as follows:

Conservatives (Clericals)	99
Liberals and Radicals	45
Socialists	40
Christian Democrats	2
	186

that is to say 87 members belonging to opposition parties over against 99 conservatives. The universal suffrage election, on the other hand, gave the following results:

Conservatives (Clericals)	71
Liberals and Radicals	34
Socialists	70
Sundry parties (of democratic tendencies)	11
	186

In short the parties of the left now possess a majority. The President of the Chamber, who has just been elected, is a socialist. The socialists are equal in number to the old conservative party, and, considering the number of votes cast in the whole country, they now form the most numerous party (about 650,000 votes against 600,000 for the conservatives and 350,000 for the liberals).

There can be no question that this

considerable socialist progress was due in part to the abolition of the plural vote. But other more important factors must also be considered—to judge from the statements of our adversaries themselves, and especially one of the most informed, M. Cyril Van Overberghe.

Trade Union Progress

First and most important is the enormous progress of our trade union movement. Before the war the Trade Union Committee of the Labor Party and the independent trade unions computed some 120,000 trade unionists. Since the war the necessity of adapting wages to the increased cost of living, which has more than tripled, has awakened the consciousness of the proletariat, and the number of trade unionists taking part in the class struggle has increased to 600,000. But the immense majority of these organized workers understood the need for extending their trade union action to the political field, and everybody is agreed in recognizing that this was the principal factor of our victory on November 16.

On the other hand there is no doubt that in the Flemish districts, where religious and conservative traditions had up to this time checked the development of socialism, the shock of the war created a new spirit among the masses. Thousands of soldiers and refugees, driven out of their native land, returned from France and England with ideas they had not formerly held. Others, forced into the workers' ranks through the ravages of war, ruined by the harshness of the occupation régime, exasperated by the shameful contrast between their misery and the wealth of the war profiteers, came in masses to socialism. Thus it happened that in the Flemish districts, where in the last elections with two or three exceptions the number of votes for us was ridiculously small, we have now elected 28 socialist deputies.

In a word the results of the Belgian elections of November, 1919, may be characterized as follows: face to face with the bourgeois party, which is weakened, reduced in numbers, and profoundly at odds within itself, particularly over the language question (setting the Flemish and the Walloons at each other's throats), the Labor Party arises as a united, disciplined force, certain of the future. For a little while longer, the time required to complete the revision of the constitution, and to make Belgium definitely a democracy, the government will remain a coalition government, which will include the democratic elements of the three parties.

But anyone would be sadly mistaken who would see in this temporary alliance, made necessary by circumstances, the permanent compromising of the Labor Party—a tendency to substitute class coöperation for the class struggle. As I wrote on the eve of the elections: "The Belgian Labor Party intends to defend in its entirety its socialist ideal. It renounces nothing. It abandons nothing. What would it profit to conquer the world, if the party should lose its own soul?"

The Czar's Police

Isaac A. Hourwich

Congressional and legislative committees, judges, preachers, and editors are vying with each other in devising legislation to eradicate sedition; patriotic citizens, impatient at the delays of the law, take upon themselves the task of meting out speedy justice to breeders of discontent. Yet all these amateurish efforts lack system, coördination, and efficiency. This is the more to be regretted when there is available for the practical statesman the age-long experience of Russian Czarism. American students of comparative legislation and administration have no adequate idea of the thoroughness of the methods of the government of the Czar. This government earnestly strove to become omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent. The writer deems it his duty to acquaint his fellow citizens with the accomplishments of that most perfect system of governmental supervision and regulation known to the history of man.

The reader will remember the grumbling occasioned last year by the slacker raid in New York City, when 60,000 perfectly law-abiding citizens were detained with the result that a few hundred slackers were discovered. In pre-revolutionary Russia, where conscription had been the rule for two centuries, such a performance would have been both impossible and unnecessary, because every individual from birth to the grave was duly recorded.

Birth Registration

Let us begin the life history of a Russian subject with his entrance into the world. Every person was required by law to be enrolled with some denominational body—a child of Christian parents had to be baptized, a child of Jewish parents had to be admitted into the synagogue within a week after its birth. It was impossible for the parents to evade the registration law, because in later life the child could not turn about without identification papers, and no identification papers could, as a rule, be obtained by a person whose birth was not registered. Of course there were provisions for relief in exceptional cases, but they involved a cumbersome proceeding. Upon attaining the draft age registration was again required of every boy.

Passport Restrictions

No person could go farther than twenty miles from his residence without a passport, on penalty of arrest and forcible deportation to his residence. A person who had no "permanent place of abode" was liable to deportation to Siberia on the charge of vagrancy. A tenant moving into a house was required to have his passport viséd at the police station of his precinct. It was the duty of the landlord to look after the enforcement of this law. In large cities the janitors of tenements and apartment houses were in effect inferior police officers.

No one could even engage a room in a hotel or in a lodging house without a passport. Whenever a tenant moved out it was the duty of the landlord or his janitor to report the fact to the police precinct. In this manner the police were enabled to check the movements of every person within the Empire. A Russian subject desiring to go abroad was required to procure a special "foreign passport," before which he was compelled to satisfy the police that he was a person of "good character." No one could obtain employment of any kind without a passport. Nor was anyone admitted to any school or hospital without proper identification papers. *In short, the common saying was that a Russian subject consisted of body, soul, and passport.*

Deportation of Foreigners

Immigration of foreigners to Russia was subject to strict governmental supervision. No foreigner was admitted to the Empire without a passport from his own government. The custom officials were at liberty to debar

any foreigner whom they deemed undesirable, without assigning any reason whatsoever for their action. The administration could, in its discretion, order the deportation of any foreigner, without the formality of a hearing and without appeal to any court or higher administrative officer. It goes without saying that every alien residing, or temporarily sojourning, within the Empire had to comply with the same passport regulations as did native-born subjects. The Russian method of supervision over the alien was obviously more thorough-going than the plan recommended a few years ago by Mr. Basil Manley of the Industrial Commission, who would confine his system of registration to aliens only.

"Disloyalty" Banned from Educational System

So much for keeping tab of the bodies of all persons within the Empire. The soul of every subject or alien was likewise under strict government control. All educational institutions, of any grade, were either maintained or supervised by the government. No private school of any grade could be established without a license from the Ministry of Education, and no license was granted to any person whose loyalty to the government was questioned. The program of instruction in public, as well as in private, educational institutions was prescribed by the Ministry of Education, while the textbooks had to be approved by the same Ministry. No person was appointed to a position in the school system who was under the faintest suspicion of "disloyalty."

The educational opportunities for the several classes of the people were suited to their station in life. The education of the peasantry was given but moderate encouragement, and, as a result, about one-half of the peasants at the outbreak of the present revolution were illiterate. Higher education of the "sons of cooks, coachmen, and lackeys" was viewed as a menace to the safety of the State, as Czar Alexander III's Minister of Education, Count Delyanov, frankly stated in a circular published in 1887. The avowed object of high schools, colleges and universities was to satisfy the demand of the government for trained officials. In order to keep an eye on the home reading of high school boys, students' homes were visited from time to time by the principals and class teachers and their rooms were searched for objectionable books. This was not done spasmodically, as have been some raids in our metropolis, but as a matter of work-a-day routine. In fact, no person suspected of disloyalty could even gain admission as a student to any high school, college, or university.

The government went even further. To prevent private initiative from interfering with the educational policy of the government, no private tutoring was permitted without a license from the Ministry of Education. Violation of this rule was punished by fine.

Freedom of the Press

The press was under a rigid and effective censorship. No one was permitted to publish a newspaper or periodical without first obtaining a license from the Censorship Board. It goes without saying that no license was granted to a person suspected of disloyalty. The editor had likewise to be approved by the Censorship Board. No issue of a magazine, paper, or book could leave the printing shop without a special permit from the censor. Violation of this rule was punished by imprisonment. As a result of these regulations the number of newspapers was small, their circulation limited, and the subscription price of most of them prohibitive for the poorer classes. They thus catered only to the intellectual class, and read very much like the *Yale Review,* or the *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* If a copy of a newspaper strayed by chance into a peasant settlement is was absolutely unintelligible to the native. The Imperial Government published an information sheet for the peasants, *The Rural Herald,* which was mailed to every county board.

Regulation of Books

An elaborate plan was worked out for the suppression of "seditious" books. No print-

ing shop could be established without a permit from the police. No person suspected of disloyalty could either obtain a permit, or be employed in any capacity in a printing shop. The proprietor of the shop was required to submit the list of his employes to the proper authorities, and to discharge at once any anti-government suspect.

A book issuing from the press had to bear the name and address of the printer, and any book without such information was liable to confiscation by the police, while the person in whose possession it was found was imprisoned. Circulation of uncensored books or other publications was punished by imprisonment or deportation to Siberia. Every book or periodical imported from a foreign country had to pass the censor before it was permitted to reach the addressee. The same rules of censorship applied to advertisements and circulars.

In order to make assurance doubly sure, the government even prohibited manufacturers of printing machinery and type from selling their products to any persons except proprietors of licensed printing shops. These manufacturers, as well as the printing shop proprietors were required to keep a record of their sales and an inventory of their stock, which were subject to periodical inspection by officers of the law.

All public libraries were placed under government supervision, and the establishment of any circulating library by any individual or group of individuals without a license was prohibited. Public libraries in Russia were few in number, many good sized cities being devoid of them. The license system also pertained to all book shops. It goes without saying that, by these laws, the government exercised a fairly effective control over the printed word.

Regulation of Speech

Public meetings or political gatherings of private citizens were discouraged. No assemblage of any kind could be held without a special permit, in the great cities even private parties of a purely social character requiring official sanction. The owner of the premises was responsible to the police for the enforcement of the law, and violators of this rule were liable to arrest and imprisonment. No exception was made even for birthday or dancing parties in private homes. A police officer was present at every meeting, whether held in a public hall or at a private residence, and he possessed the power to disperse the assemblage at his own discretion.

Freedom of association was also unknown in the days of the Czar. No association for any purpose in any part of the realm could be organized without the approval of the imperial administration at St. Petersburg, and the closest scrutiny was exercised in regard to the organizers of every association applying for an imperial charter. Prior to the disturbances of 1905, no debating clubs or other student societies were permitted to be formed in high schools, colleges, and universities.

A few societies chartered by the government were under constant supervision by the police. The membership rolls of every organization of any character were at all times open to the police. It goes without saying that the organization of labor unions was strictly forbidden. A secret labor union was treated as a criminal conspiracy and its members were usually punished by deportation to Siberia. Strikes, even though perfectly peaceable in their nature, were looked upon as a form of rebellion against constituted authority. The rigor of these anti-strike laws, however, had to be relaxed after the general strike of October, 1905. Yet even the laws enacted in those troublous times placed the activities of labor unions under strict supervision of the government. Similar laws applied to coöperative associations. Thus the government had complete control of every form of organized social effort.

Agents Provocateurs

To carry out in practice such an all-embracing plan of regulation and supervision required a powerful machinery for the enforcement of law. Unquestioning obedience

of the minor officialdom to the orders of the supreme administrative authority was assured by making every official subject to removal at the pleasure of his superiors. Nor did the judiciary enjoy a fixed tenure of office. In this way harmonious coöperation of the judicial and the executive branch of the government was attained.

The Russian police force was organized as an Imperial Constabulary, subject to the jurisdiction of the Imperial Police Department. A widely ramified secret service organization had its salaried agents in every walk of life. Secret service men found their way into the membership of the most important committees of every political party. A secret service agent was one of the leaders of the fighting bands of the Social Revolutionist party and actively participated in all its plots. Another secret service agent was high in the councils of the Bolsheviki and was, with the aid of the police, elected to the Fourth Duma as a candidate of the Bolshevik faction. Secret service agents were among the leaders of some of the greatest strikes.

The organized forces of the government had the coöperation of patriotic organizations, such as the Union of Archangel Michael and the Union of the Russian people, popularly known as the "Black Hundred," of which Czar Nicholas II was an honorary member. On occasions these organizations took it upon themselves to administer stern justice to seditionists in ways not unfamiliar in this country.

Power of Search

Of course the Russian autocracy was fully aware of the fact that never in human history was there a law but that evil-minded persons did not attempt to evade it. The administrative officials were accordingly clothed with unlimited discretionary power to cope with sedition. The privacy of the mails was never recognized by the government. The mail of any suspected person was opened and read by the post-office inspectors. The same applied to telegrams. The police were empowered to enter any private dwelling at any time of the day or night and to make a search of the premises—if deemed necessary, to break the walls or the floors, to tear the mattresses, to search the cradles, to enter the bedroom where women were sleeping and to watch them while they were dressing. *Salus rei publicae lex suprema est*—was the watchword. The police were authorized at any time to arrest any person upon suspicion and to keep the prisoner incommunicado as long as it was deemed necessary. It was no unusual thing for a person to be kept incommunicado for a year or two and then to be released for want of any kind of incriminating evidence. The administration had the power to deport any person to Siberia without trial for five years upon suspicion of disloyalty. This term could be continued from time to time by executive order, for another five years. The privilege of counsel was denied to persons held on suspicion of disloyalty.

Any person suspected of disloyalty could be placed under police surveillance, which meant that he was denied a passport for leaving the city, town, or village where he resided, that his mail was opened by the police, and that all his movements were watched. All persons associating with a political suspect were also watched by the police.

Most political offenses were in actual practice not bailable. The government did not trust a jury with the trial of a person indicted for a political offense. The public was, as a rule, excluded from political trials, while the press was forbidden to report court proceedings of this nature. Civilians charged with grave political crimes could be tried by courts-martial. Where an appeal from a sentence rendered by a court-martial was allowed as a matter of law, it was invariably denied by the appellate court.

Thousands of political offenders were summarily executed during the few years following the disturbances of 1905-1906. The number of persons arrested on suspicion and dealt with by executive order during the same

period may conservatively be estimated at 100,000.[1]

The Conscript Army

The Imperial Government had a standing conscript army of a million men, which was thought sufficient to cope with any popular disturbance. In cases of urgent need the National Reserve army, numbering millions of honorably discharged soldiers, could be called out. The soldiers were always assigned to service far away from the section from which they had been drafted, so as to eliminate the possible effect of local sympathies. Unlawful assemblages and strikers' meetings were unhesitatingly suppressed by armed force.

From the preceding brief review it appears that the Russian legislators and executives left no room for seditious activity, and closed every avenue of escape to plotters against "the Throne and the Fatherland." This system was not created in one legislative session. It was thoughtfully and assiduously elaborated by generations of statesmen, guided by the light of practical experience and unhampered by irksome constitutional limitations. The question naturally suggests itself—did this system work?

The answer to it must be both affirmative and negative. It did work for half a century, following the abolition of serfdom. It ended, however, in the greatest revolution in history, which has destroyed the whole ruling class of Imperial Russia, and upset the old political, economic, and social structure.

Can our own Overman and Lusk committees, our postmaster general, our attorney general, and our judges improve upon the work of Pobyedonostzov, Plehve, Stolypin, and other faithful servants of the Czar? Or will they learn the lesson of the Russian Revolution which is storming before theireyes?

[1] In the spring of 1906, at the opening of the First Duma, according to the Russian newspaper reports, the number of political prisoners was given at 77,000. This report was never denied by the government.

Has Liberalism Failed?

S. E.

One could make a number of assertions about the Russian Revolution of November, 1917, which, if proved true, would be very significant. We might say, for example, that it is the first decisive victory of the "proletariat" over the "bourgeoisie"; that it is a beautiful vindication of the hypothesis of economic determinism; that it represents, notwithstanding, an important reinterpretation of the Marxian theory; that it proves the superiority of direct action over political action; that it offers a decisive refutation of the doctrines of political liberalism, etc., etc.

I cannot help feeling that the most significant of such assertions is that which interprets the November Revolution as having given a blow to political liberalism from which it cannot recover. If that be true, then the one formidable rival of economic determinism has been vanquished once for all, and we may expect less confusion henceforth in the treatment of political questions.

It is not necessary to offer here a definition of political liberalism; characterization thereof will serve our present purpose. It relies, as we all know, on "freedom of discussion," universal suffrage, "representative government" and other so-called democratic institutions for the establishment of justice between classes and the introduction of political or other formal institutional changes demanded by social and industrial revolution. Liberals do not, of course, believe that mere machinery will automatically perform these functions. Rather, they impute a high efficacy to ideas, and to the tendencies in human nature which make for harmony and cooperation; and the machinery which they establish and defend is more to facilitate the invention of ideas, and the expression or organization of these tendencies, than of itself to render any positive service.

First, Liberals are incurably intellectualistic, attributing to thought a function and to

ideas an efficacy which they do not possess. Secondly, they assume that a majority of people are capable of arriving at sound conclusions in regard to public questions. Thirdly, they assume that these conclusions will be normally determined by considerations of social justice and social expediency. Fourthly, they regard "freedom of discussion" as a guarantee that political proposals all have a substantially equal, or at least a fair, chance of getting themselves accepted, provided they merit serious consideration. Fifthly, they believe that democratic political institutions will or may be made to translate into action the wishes of the people as thus rationally and ethically determined.

These assumptions are not often so explicitly stated in liberalist writings, but they are, nevertheless, implicit in all the liberal's thinking on political questions. We may go even further and say that liberals *must* believe all these things, as a rejection of any one of them would convert the liberal theory into something quite different. In the philosopher's language they are *postulates* which are never seriously questioned. Upon them the whole liberal edifice is founded. These postulates must be re-examined in the light of recent psychological analysis and of recent historical events. So much has indeed been done in this direction already that we are now in a position to maintain that all these assumptions are fallacies based on a profound misconception of human nature.

The Supremacy of Ideas

First, then, liberals are intellectualistic, rationalistic, idealistic, or whatever synonym of these terms we may care to apply to them. There is always in liberalist thinking the implication that conflicting groups can be reconciled to each other if you can only bring them together, and keep them together long enough, to talk over and settle their differences; or at least if such groups cannot be brought into intellectual agreement, they can be persuaded to compromise and to compromise as often as may be necessary to safeguard the interests of the public at large. Labor, for example, ought not and it will not, if it is reasonable, press its claims to the point of violently upsetting the social order. Capital, likewise, ought and will, if it is wise, make such concessions to labor as will obviate the necessity of any too upsetting conflict between them. The "public" ought and will, if well advised, hold the balance between the two and cudgel into submission either party to the conflict which proves itself refractory to the counsels of reason and justice. In all this it is assumed that the actions of most people are or may be rationally determined, and determined in the interests of society at large. The anomalies of conduct would, for the liberal, be, not consistently rational behavior, but behavior which was perversely irrational.

Such a conception of human behavior is now hopelessly discredited both by political science and by the facts of social life as interpreted by the adepts in this science. People's actions, we all ought to know by this time, are determined by their interests and by habits of thought impressed on them by their environment. Real thought plays a relatively small part in the development of these interests and the formation of these habits; they are for the most part impressed on us by others and by the circumstances in which we find ourselves. As mere everyday illustrations of this truth we may cite the fact that party affiliations are, in a large proportion of cases, a matter of family or local tradition; that the political opinions of the average man are similar to those expressed in the editorials or implied in the news columns of the paper he reads; that there are proportionately more socialists among wage-earners than among capitalists; that a comparatively large percentage of "intellectuals" are also liberals, etc.

It is not that the views of the liberals on particular questions are unsound; it is that they are unable to give effect to their views or to frame practicable programs for giving effect to them. They begin and end with ideas and ideals, and assume in effect that ideas and ideals are self-effectuating, whereas psychologists now know that ideas and

ideals are secondary and derived, that they have hidden roots reaching far down into tradition and instinct, and that they are not so much suffused with sweetness and light as liberals are prone to suppose. More precisely, liberals believe that ideas and ideals may reconcile or synthesize interests which are plainly opposed to each other, interests which can secure their maximum satisfaction only at the expense of other interests, and which therefore cannot be harmonized in the way that liberals desire. In psychological terms, the liberal makes the will-side of human nature subordinate to the ideational side, whereas the real relationship is more nearly the reverse. To put it differently, liberals hold that ideas are or may be social or synthetic in the broadest sense, whereas ideas are generally expressive of or instrumental to interests of a much narrower range than that.

Ideas and Power

We may grant that ideas, properly understood, do rule, but it is not the ideas of the professional thinker, and least of all the ideas of the liberal thinker. It is the ideas of classes who stand to lose or gain a prize that is cherished, and not the ideas of a detached thinker who dreams of a perfect justice or the liberation of all the oppressed. Whenever opposing interests could be said to be harmonized through ideas, it is where one set of ideas is given a victory over other ideas, and because the victorious ideas had superior *power* on their side. The victors may, of course, be satisfied with something less than the extermination of their opponents; they may absorb the latter, or be willing to let them occupy a subordinate position, or they may even be willing to pursue a policy of live-and-let-live and accord to them a position of co-ordinate dignity and power. Whichever policy is adopted will depend on the nature of the issue between the contestants and, it may be, on their relative strength, but only in a minor degree on the abstract ideals of justice accepted by the winning side.

The function of thought, so far as the world of affairs is concerned, is to search out means for the satisfaction of whatever interests happen to be regnant at the given time and place. Ideas are the products of these thought processes and will be as compatible or incompatible with each other as the interests for whose furtherance real thought is undertaken. The liberal confuses the engine with the steam, the machine with the motive force which drives it, and believes, in effect, in a machine that will propel itself. The sooner we discard this dream of a perpetual motion in the world of politics, the sooner we shall be able to grapple with political realities. In the interest of a meticulous accuracy, this criticism would no doubt need a good deal of qualification, but as a working characterization of the liberalist position it would seem to be fair enough. If all mankind were motivated by liberalist ideals, then the liberal program would not be as footless as it is; but mankind being what it is, we must talk a great deal more in terms of interest and power, and a good deal less in terms of ideas and ideals. The liberals are tender-minded, to use William James's term, and are ever doomed to defeat by the tough-minded people who actually get things done. This is not to deny any positive value to liberalist activity. Liberals do render an important service in exposing injustice, in showing that the status of a class or a group ought to be improved, but their service stops at this point, except in the rare cases where they hold the balance of power between conflicting groups. And it may be doubted whether they have ever determined the final decision on an issue of prime importance, at least where vital group interests were concerned.

The positive function of the liberal is to furnish light on certain kinds of political questions, but they are wanting when it comes to furnishing heat, and particularly the heat that generates steam. Or, to vary our figure, the liberals may be the salt of the earth, but they do not provide the calories which sustain the earth.

Hungary Under Bela Kun

Alice Riggs Hunt

The chief difficulty met with in breaking into Communist Hungary was not so much the securing of passports as the obtaining of train service. Nobody seemed to know just when a wood-burning engine would be available and, when it was at hand, there was no certainty that it would carry you all the way from Vienna to Budapest. In 1910 I had taken this journey in five or six hours, but in May, 1919, I learned that it would probably take me twenty-four hours after the train had actually started. The ticket man at the station added further to the gayety of the occasion by informing me that I went entirely at my own risk, as severe fighting was going on along the line between the Hungarians and Rumanians, and that if I ever did arrive at Budapest, it was not at all certain when I would be able to leave again. Three months he thought a conservative estimate of the time I would probably be detained in that capital. You never could predict the fortunes of war, he said, and if the Rumanians took or cut off the railroad, God help those in Hungary. I could buy my ticket to the border town of Brouck if I liked.

At Brouck there is a little river, which in America would be called a brook. This river separated Socialist Austria from Communist Hungary, the only means of communication being a hundred-foot bridge wide enough for an ordinary hay wagon to pass over. At the Austrian end of the bridge the traveler waits patiently in line for two or three hours until his passport is viséed by the Austrian petty official sitting in the sentinel box at the Austrian end of the bridge. On this occasion I had three passports, American, Austrian and Hungarian. All had to be stamped and countersigned by the official in the sentry box, and then you were free to take two hundred steps to the Hungarian end of the bridge, where the performance had to be repeated. As you gazed from the Austrian sentry box across the bridge to the three tall red guards standing beyond the gate leading into Communist Hungary, you saw nothing visibly red about them except two little triangles on each side of the front of their collars. Their uniforms were just as sickly a greenish-brownish hue, very much faded, as those worn by any of the Italian soldiers while occupying Austria. A second look showed you that the men were younger, taller, and better set up than any Italian soldier you had seen, but you could not discover anything visibly "red" further than the patches on the collar.

Having learned that the word elftasch meant comrade in Hungarian, I extended my left hand holding the three passports and said in my best Hungarian, "Americanisher Elftasch." The effect was magic. Three right hands were raised, and the gate was opened without a glance at the passports. The three right hands stayed rigidly at salute, while an officer advanced and asked if I would not partake of refreshment. I decidedly would. Three hours later I was comfortably seated in the only second-class car attached to the train. I had eaten heartily of *white bread, real coffee and real milk,* and the terrible red guard had arranged that this car should be attached to the train of third-class and box-cars, so that I need not stand up all night. The corridor of the car swarmed with men, women, children and bags, and more peasants climbed to the roof of the car, pulling their bundles behind them, glad to sit there all night so long as the train carried them to their destination. We seemed to pass thousands of empty idle freight cars, but my thoughts were constantly with those men, women and children sitting on the top of my car as I watched the sparks from the engine illuminate the night like rockets on the Fourth of July.

Budapest

At 1.30 in the morning the train arrived at Budapest. The station was dark and closed. One dilapidated "victoria" with an emaciated

horse and a sleepy driver stood in the entrance. The driver woke up sufficiently to charge one hundred kronen ($20) for the fifteen-minute ride to the hotel. Around the first corner you came face to face with a huge poster of Lenin's head pasted on the wall. Looking down the street, you saw the same poster on nearly every wall and many red flags hanging from windows. Three or four times on the trip across town the "terrible red guard patrol" stopped the rig and demanded passports. "Americanisher Elftasch" worked better and better as my pronunciation improved, and with the lantern held close to my face the driver was ordered to proceed. Three hotels were visited before I decided to ask for permission to stay at the Soviet House, where all the commissars and their families lived. It used to be the Grand Hotel Hungaria where I stayed in 1910, and at three o'clock I found myself in a clean warm bed, after a "terrible red guard" had brought me *real tea and bread.*

The next morning my first thought was to see Bela Kun. Writing on my visiting card, "Will you give me an appointment as soon as possible, please? It is very important," I asked the porter to take it to Bela Kun's room. Four months' training at the Peace Conference had led me to hope that if I saw Bela Kun at all, it would be in five days' time at the earliest, and maybe five months. It was my first communist shock, therefore, when the porter approached me in the breakfast room just as I was breaking the first egg I had seen since leaving Switzerland and handed me Bela Kun's card with an invitation to meet him in one hour in the Foreign Office. Shock number two came when the porter refused my generous tip for the success of his mission. His wage was a living wage, he said, and I was eating no more food than every workman in Hungary was allowed and could afford to buy. "Who are all these workmen eating in the dining-room of the Soviet House?" I asked. "They are workmen from all over Hungary, who had come to consult the various commissars about things vital to them," said the porter. "But this is a dictatorship, not a democracy," I reminded him. "A dictatorship," he repeated, "but of course the commissars must consult the people, and I must know that much business is done between laborers and commissars in this dining-room."

There were not as many "terrible red guards" around the Soviet House as there were orderlies on every floor of the Hotel de Crillon in Paris, where the American Commission to Negotiate Peace resided. On my way to the Foreign Office, I was only asked once for my pass, instead of ten times, as had been my experience in going to every reception held at the Paris White House. The streets were deadly quiet and very clean. The "gutters of blood" were evidently not in the vicinity of the Soviet House. I walked along the bank of the Danube and started across the bridge to Buda. My eyes were on the palace of the ancient Hungarian kings, high above the opposite bank, and I was thinking that the only outward and visible sign of communism was the red flag flying from its highest tower. Suddenly the word *elftasch* broke in upon my reveries. The sentinel at this end of the bridge must be saluting some one. *Elftasch* in thunderous tones made me look around to see a tall "terrible red guard" pointing to the opposite side of the bridge. I motioned and started across, saying "Americanischer Elftasch." We both laughed, and I understood that foot passengers must not take the left side of the bridge. This was the worst terror I experienced during my entire visit to Hungary! Buying my ticket to go up the funicular railroad to the Plaza of the Palace, selecting the proper entrance to this huge pile of masonry, and finally arriving in the anteroom of the Foreign Office was all accelerated in kindly fashion by "terrible red guards" on duty along the line. Working men and working women were sitting or standing about the gorgeous apartment, or talking to some official. It was not difficult to penetrate to the inner office of Bela Kun, the Commissary of Foreign Affairs.

Bela Kun

Bela Kun came out of his private office promptly at the hour appointed and invited me to enter and to ask him any question I desired. Bela Kun is a powerfully built man, with wide, well developed shoulders, a thick neck, closely cropped light hair, blue eyes, a rather snub nose and very large mouth with thick lips. He gave the appearance of tremendous physical strength and alert action with quick decision. His answers were direct and informative, and his manner entirely frank.

My first question had to do with the primary object of the second Hungarian revolution. Bela Kun replied that the chief goal of the revolution was the abolition of classes, and that the socialization of capital was the fundamental step towards this end. All wealth in shares and dividends had been confiscated, and classes no longer existed except for the purpose of food distribution. He explained that food was rationed first to manual workers and women and children, then to brain and intellectual workers, and, thirdly, to the bourgeois, whom he defined as those who did not work.

My next question was whether he had organized the elected soviets along political geographical lines, or whether the idea of the communist government was to build up a purely industrial government. Bela Kun replied that they had first organized along political lines, giving each worker a vote for the representative of his district. He carefully explained that housewives were eligible to vote on the strength of their standing in the community as workers. The political districts were to be merely temporary, he said, because the object of the communists was the establishment of a purely industrial republic, based upon the workers. He added that many things were still undone, as the government had been in power for only two months, and that I would probably find numerous things to criticise, but that all the commissars were working sixteen hours or more a day in order to construct a permanent structure.

The organization of industry and commerce had been greatly accelerated by the selection of "intellectuals" for heads of departments. The attitude of the communists towards these "intellectuals" (bourgeois men and women who had supported the cause of communism before the revolution or had signified their willingness to help in establishing it on a firm basis since the revolution was brought about), had been put to a vote of the party after a thorough discussion at party conferences. Some members were of the opinion that none could be trusted, but the great majority decided that, as the "intellectuals" had never had an opportunity to practice the communist system, they should be encouraged to work for it and could be trusted. The head of the coöperative societies was elected as Food Commissary, a young engineer was put in charge of the socialization of factories, and a young philosopher was made Commissary of Schools. Every useful man willing to work with the Communist Government was given a place in it.

Steps Toward Socialization

The first step in the socialization of industry was to transfer the factories from capitalist to communist control. This was done almost without a hitch, as production did not stop for more than half a day. The Production Commissary was first appointed to represent the entire community, while, at the same time, the workers of each factory elected a controlling council of workmen, to represent the interests of the workmen of that particular factory. The chief function of the factory control council was to see that no financial arrangements were made by the commissary to the detriment of the workers. This factory control council had the right to inspect every letter leaving or entering the factory.

The second step was that of organizing the manufacture of articles of the same kind into one unit. For instance, mills or factories producing the same thing were organized into one centralized group under the department of Social Production. Each group united a certain number of factories producing the same article and, as there was no competition be-

tween the individual factories, they could be managed so as to produce the greatest output with the least expenditure. The intellectual work of the factories, such as designing machinery, making chemical tests of materials and laboratory work, was centralized so that the best experts could be obtained at the highest wages, and all results could be available to all branches of the work. Patents were abolished, but government departments were established where inventions were examined.

Workers' Councils

The third step in the work of socializing production was the organization of councils of representatives from the control council of each factory. This linked up the workmen in each factory to his entire industry. The individual workman elected the Factory Control Council, which in turn elected representatives to the Trade Control Council. The Trade Control Council in its turn elected representatives to the Production Trade Council, which was representative of all trades and industries, and worked under the Commissar of Social Production, who was the government's representative.

Organizing Distribution

Closely allied with the control of production was the regulation of the sale of the product. This was accomplished first by limiting the purchasing power of wealthy people, and, secondly, by limiting the amount of money wealthy people could draw from their accounts in the socialized banks. The first step was the socializing of all shops employing more than ten persons and their organization into central distributing centers in each district as government stores. No one could purchase anything from these stores without a signed permit from the Council of Social Production in his or her district, which stated that the article was needed. This was done to prevent people with money from buying up what few supplies there were. The second method was that of limiting the income of the people with money to that of the highest paid manual worker. At the time of the revolution, if a person had an account in a bank, that amount up to a hundred thousand kronen was credited to him, but the power to draw upon the account was limited to two thousand kronen a month. If a person's wealth before the revolution happened to have been in merchandise, such as a department store, the value of the property up to one hundred thousand kronen was credited in the socialized bank. The bourgeoisie was therefore not deprived of the means of existence, as one hundred thousand kronen was considered all that an industrious workman could save from his earnings during his lifetime, and two thousand kronen a month was the highest wage paid.

Housing

The housing problem was studied in the same way. Commissar Somlo found that, of the two hundred thousand proletarians in Budapest, one-half were living in misery. In two months he was able to place twenty-one thousand persons in rooms, allowing one room for each person, with a maximum of four rooms for a family. This he considered a purely temporary makeshift, as he hoped to have raw materials of some sort to build new houses for the workmen. Specialists, such as doctors, dentists, writers, and artists, were generally allowed, by vote of the local soviet, two rooms apiece. The extra room was given to these specialists as their work was considered a valuable contribution to the community. As far as possible the bourgeoisie were allowed to select their own friends to occupy the extra rooms at their disposal and the rent collectors were elected by the tenants. According to M. Somlo all houses of prostitution in Budapest had been abolished.

Amusement and Education

The theatres and operas were running as usual except that the performances began at five o'clock in the afternoon and ended at eight-thirty, in order to allow the workers to go directly from their employment to their amusement and to get home early at night. Ninety per cent. of the seats at the socialized theatres and at the opera could be obtained

only by members of the trade unions, while the other ten per cent. were for sale at higher rates for the bourgeoisie. The actors, musicians, and dancers were paid the highest wage by the government, because they were considered among the most useful workers.

Lukatz, the Commissar of Education, planned to have the theatres and operas great educational centres for the people. Cheap editions of Shakespeare and other classics, including, of course, Hungarian writers, were already published and, while I was there, Shakespeare plays were being acted in various places in Hungary. The teachers were paid the highest rate of wages and it was planned to employ artists and writers who could produce suitable books which would fit in with school studies, for children from six to ten, ten to thirteen, and thirteen to nineteen. The study of law was stopped in the universities, as it was considered a relic of the old system, and the law school building was turned into a people's university, to which students were admitted on the recommendation of their trade unions. All students were automatically members of the teachers' trade unions and had a voice in the councils of these unions. Each school had its disciplinary tribunals elected by the students and constituting a veritable students' soviet in the schools.

Justice

Bela Vago, the President of the Revolutionary Tribunal, stated that crime had noticeably decreased since alcohol had been abolished, and that the organization of local tribunals was very nearly completed. No lawyers were allowed in the revolutionary courts, the forty-eight judges sitting in rotation with four on the bench serving at the same time. The judges were paid the wages of specialists, which was equivalent to the wage received by the highest paid manual laborer. Up to the time of my visit, there were neither women judges nor women's courts. Since the communist revolution, there had been only two cases of capital punishment, both of which were for counter-revolutionary activity. At the time of the establishment of this court, five thousand libel suits were pending. The Revolutionary Tribunal asked that unnecessary cases be withdrawn and gave warning that plaintiffs found to have unsubstantiated cases would be fined for obstructing the business of the court. In less than two days four hundred and sixty of the libel cases were withdrawn. Shortly after their establishment, the Revolutionary Tribunals took hostages from the bourgeoisie as safeguards against counter-revolutionary activities, but, although the opposition continued, the hostages were soon released. The public could obtain entrance to the court room by permit from the President. The case that was being tried the day I was present was that of an ex-officer accused of harshly treating workingmen during the performance of army duties. The case took several hours with witnesses for and against the accused, but the verdict was to the effect that, while the accused might be guilty, it would not be just to convict him, as in the carrying out of his duties as an officer in the Austro-Hungarian army he had been the victim of the old régime of the Hapsburgs and therefore could not be held responsible for indignities perpetrated against workingmen.

Sources of Discontent

The three sources of discontent with the new order seemed to spring from the wealthy bourgeoisie, the women belonging to the professional and small shop-keeping classes in the cities who found it difficult to obtain food without standing long hours in queues, and the peasants in the provinces who had all the food they needed and disliked to accept the money printed by the new government. Of these groups the most active seemed to be the women, as they were encouraged by the priests. The peasants were more or less inarticulate except for their withholding of food, and the wealthy bourgeoisie, according to a prominent ex-statesman with whom I had had a three hours' talk, were either thoroughly disorganized or were waiting for the government to fall under the weighty problems of food distribution. This ex-statesman, whose name is known throughout the world as recently one of the most powerful of Hungary's

citizens and politicians, told me that while his house was visited by red guards immediately after the communist coup in March, no member of his family was harmed and all property seized by the state was preserved and not destroyed. This gentleman's attitude towards the new government can be expressed in his one sentence in answer to my query as to his opinion of Bela Kun. "They are all robbers and nothing but common Jews," he said. This royalist applied the same terms to Karolyi, his cousin, for his part in handing over the government to the dictator. This would appear to express the sum total of the bourgeois opposition, as there was no sign of their having any active organization and as the work of disarming them had been very thoroughly carried out by the red guard.

The discontent of the women was met by the government in the holding of twelve mass meetings especially for women at which Bela Kun and the other commissars explained the situation. The speakers stated that, under the old government, the proletarians had never had enough to eat, but that, in spite of the Entente blockade, Hungary was now better fed than any country in central Europe. It was only a question of fuel for the engines that brought the food to the cities and of forcing the peasants to release that food by threat of denying them agricultural implements and other necessities for the harvest. Commissar Hamburger of the agricultural department told the women that already twelve million acres of unproductive land was under cultivation by the co-operative societies and that village selling centers were also being organized to facilitate the shipment of food to the cities.

At a meeting of the Budapest Soviet the Food Commissar reproved the shouts from the members to the effect that food was not being distributed adequately, by stating that the proletarians were doing as much smuggling of food from the country as the bourgeois were and that they must not expect the government to accomplish more than any other country in Europe, namely, the immediate control of an adequate food supply. Upon his statement that he had been working in the socialist movement for twenty-five years many of the young soldier members shouted, "That is long enough to make you a bourgeois." The twenty women members of the Soviet took little part in the shouts of protest coming from the soldier element among the members, 65 per cent. of whom were proletarians. The mere fact that women were members of the Soviet was a revolution in itself for Hungary. Bela Kun told me that women had taken a very conspicuous and laudable part in the second revolution. Although the feminists and women suffragists were not in sympathy with the revolution they did little to frustrate it and the bourgeois pacifists, especially the women, had been effective in keeping the revolution bloodless. There were no women commissars, but many women were the heads of departments especially under the Commissar of Education.

I had a meeting with twenty women leaders in the House of Parliament and for three or four hours they told me of their work for the revolution. Nearly everyone of these women had opposed the war and most of them had been in prison for their opposition. They were glad to be able to tell me that equal pay for equal work had already been established under Bela Kun's régime and that such women's organizations as the Union of Domestic Employees had become so strong that the weekly paper, the *Woman Worker,* had a circulation of several hundred thousand copies. These women were of the opinion that there should never be any separate women's movement, but that the women should find their places in the men's organizations. One of these women leaders told me that whether this particular government lasted or not the seed of communism was sure to take root in Hungary. Whether the Entente succeeded in starving the Hungarians or not this young woman predicted that once the workers of Hungary had the vision of what communism could accomplish in a few months that vision would be their standard in judging any future government set up by foreign bayonets.

The Socialist Review

Published Monthly by the
INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY
Room 914, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Editor, Harry W. Laidler. Wesleyan.
Managing Editor, W. Harris Crook. Oxford.

Editorial Board

James W. Alexander.....Princeton
Emily G. Balch.....Bryn Mawr
Evans Clark.....Amherst
H. W. L. Dana.....Harvard
Felix Grendon.....Columbia
Jessie Wallace Hughan.....Barnard
Winthrop D. Lane.....Michigan
F. F. Rockwell.....Wesleyan
Alexander Trachtenberg.....Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James Oneal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Sidney Zimand.

Seeing Red

Up to January 14, 1920, some five thousand "Reds" had been "corralled" or "rounded up" by the Department of Justice, while at least two thousand more were still due for arrest before the end of June, according to the announcement before the House Appropriations Committee of Commissioner of Immigration Caminetti when pleading for a fund of one million dollars to continue this campaign (*Evening Sun,* January 14).

Since our December issue went to press the apparent attack upon radicals of various types has developed considerably. The time-honored baiting of the I. W. W., now seemingly a fully licensed process for the spare time of local and federal officials, has been extended to "reds" of the Emma Goldman type, as witness the "Soviet Ark"; from there to a wholesale nation-wide sweep for members and leaders of the Communist and Communist Labor parties, and finally the Albany attack upon the parent body itself, the Socialist Party.

The Centralia Aftermath

On Armistice Day last year there was held in Centralia, Wash., an official parade of a patriotic nature. As the parade passed the local headquarters of the Industrial Workers of the World, according to testimony of one Frank Bickford, himself a parader, the ranks broke and rushed for the hall, breaking down the door and forcibly entering. The mob was met by armed resistance by the I. W. W. members within the hall, and in the tragedy that followed three ex-service men were killed. A mob subsequently took from jail and lynched one Wesley Everetts, an ex-soldier, who had seen duty in France, on the plea that he had taken part in the defense of the hall and therefore in the killing of the paraders. Violent class feeling has characterized the west coast for some time, and has now reached breaking point. Proof of this is seen in the fact that Edward Reinhart, who for some years has been employed by the Associated Press, was forced to flee Centralia by the business interests after he had wired the A. P. a story of the Armistice Day affair in which he stated that the I. W. W. hall had been attacked by a mob before a shot was fired by anyone in the building (*New York Call,* Nov. 28), and in the arrest of one of the attorneys for defense, Elmer Stuart Smith of Centralia, on the charge of murder of Warren Grimm, parader, on November 11. Smith is not an I. W. W., nor was he present in the hall at the time of the parade! Attorney Ralph Pierce of Seattle has been refused the right to enter Centralia to defend the I. W. W. men. Finally chief counsel for defense, George F. Vandeveer, was arrested in Vancouver, Wash., on the charge of "conversing with some county prisoners at Vancouver last October"! In spite, therefore, of the evidence of Dr. Bickford, and the refusal of the coroner's jury to accuse the I. W. W. of murder, a fair trial seems improbable in the atmosphere of class warfare that exists in Centralia.

The "Soviet Ark"

On December 21 at dawn the old army transport Buford, a ship 28 years old, set sail for Europe with 249 deported "aliens" on board, including Emma Goldman (for thirty-four

years in the U. S. A.) and Alexander Berkman. The State Department cabled to European governments the reason for their action, describing the deportees as follows:

"They are a menace to law and order. They hold theories which are antagonistic to the orderly processes of modern civilization. . . . They are arrayed in opposition to government, to decency, to justice. . . . They are anarchists. They are persons of such character as to be undesirable in the United States." (*N. Y. Times,* December 24.)

On the other hand, Rev. Percy Stickney Grant of the Church of the Ascension, New York, declared: "Those who sailed in the Mayflower were composed largely of prisoners from London Jail, referred to in history as 'partakers in an uncompleted reform.' Those who were deported this morning might be said to be partakers in an uncompleted democracy." (*New York Call,* December 22.)

The deportees in many cases had families in America, from whom they were forcibly separated. A (newspaper) "riot" occurred as a result of this unfair treatment, when several of the deportees' wives, hearing rumors of the Buford's departure, rushed to the Ellis Island ferry house. Mrs. Abe Brook is reported as saying:

"They arrest my husband. When I go to find out about it they tell me 'Don't worry, don't worry.' Every time I come back they say 'Everything all right.' I ask if they going to send him away. 'Not yet,' they say. Then before I can tell him 'good-by' he's gone on the seas. I'll never see him again."

Her plea at the ferry house was met by a reply, "You'll never see your husband again. They'll drown him." Mrs. Brook in natural indignation put her fist through the ferry office window and was arrested in the ensuing "riot." After spending some time in jail the Magistrate suspended her sentence after asking her if she were convinced *it didn't pay to raise such disturbances!* Her husband, Abe Brook, was deported for having been "a member of the Union of Russian Workers, caught in Union Square distributing anarchistic literature" (*N. Y. Times,* December 23), though his own evidence gives a very different story. (See Winthrop Lane, "The Buford Widows," in *The Survey,* January 10, 1920.)

Ethel Bernstein, another deportee, was the wife of Samuel Lipman who is condemned to spend twenty years in Atlanta prison under the Espionage act. The government itself admits that at least twenty other families of deportees "show signs of distress," or, in other words, have lost their breadwinners. (*Evening Sun,* January 14.) In view of the break-up of families caused by the sailing of the Buford, Attorney General Palmer's words in his New Year message to the nation ring ironically: "Its [the Soviet government's] sympathizers in this country . . . are enemies of the government, of the church, and *of the home,* and advocate principles which mean the abolition of all three of these safeguards of civilization!" (Italics ours.)

The New Year Raids

Further raids on a larger scale than ever and nation-wide in character occurred early in the New Year. The majority were Federal in their inception, though one or two cities, notably Chicago, stole a march on the Federal authorities and organized a hunt of their own on a state basis. This time the varied membership of two political groups was the main quarry. "There is no pretense that the few thousand victims of the round-up had counselled crime or instigated violence. The men and women who were arrested were charged simply and solely with being members of the Communist or Communist Labor parties. Adherence to the platform of these parties, publicly adopted in open convention a few months ago, was deemed sufficient to warrant deportation and imprisonment." (*New Republic,* January 14.) The general accusation against these two parties is that they advocate the overthrow of the existing form of government by force and *violence.* Coupled with this charge is that of being *anarchists,* disbelievers in any organized government, a sign of loose thinking on the part of those who make the charge.

In point of fact the Communist Party declared its purpose to be "the education and organization of the working class for the es-

tablishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which will lead to the abolition of the capitalist system and the establishment of the communist society." The same party defines "*revolutionary* industrial unionism"—a phrase seized upon everywhere as proving their belief in *violence*—as "the training, disciplining, and equipping of the proletariat for the complete control and management, operation, and administration of industry by the workers themselves." Louis Fraina, a prominent member of the Communist Party, declares point blank, "the proletarian revolution is not fostered by *violence*, but it makes use of industrial power and organized force." (*Revolutionary Socialism*, p. 136.) Any students of Professor John Dewey of Columbia will hardly require this explanation of the very important distinction between the use of *force*, economic or industrial (such as a "folded arms" strike), and a resort to violence (such as the French Revolution), yet the statements from our leading officials and editors confuse the issue in precisely this manner.

Similarly the Communist Labor Party defines its ultimate aim as "the creation of an *industrial republic* wherein the machinery of production shall be socialized so as to guarantee to the workers the full social value of the product of their toil." (Italics ours). It is interesting in this connection to recall Charles M. Schwab's reputed remark that "nothing creates value but labor." (*N. Y. Times*, January 6.)

Finally the most hunted and detested of organizations, the Industrial Workers of the World, at the close of a long editorial on the Centralia tragedy in which the suppressed facts of the case are stated, declares:

"Members of the working class: rally to the defense of the I. W. W. Adequate legal defense must and shall be provided for every imprisoned member of the I. W. W. Organize, organize! *Peaceable*, economic, direct action will yet triumph over the direct, brutal, physical violence of the capitalist class!" (Italics ours.) (*New Solidarity*, November 25.)

In spite of such police methods as those involved in chaining the prisoners together after the manner of the slave gang, *in Boston*, in making the arrests, no resistance was offered and no weapons found on those arrested. (*N. Y. Times*, January 3.) That average level-headed public opinion is beginning to doubt the wisdom of this wholesale lynch, raid, and deportation process is seen in the following comment of the *N. Y. World* (January 14):

"Most of the activities that are going on in the way of suppressing extreme radicalism are in the nature of lynch law. Officials act first and then try to find the evidence on which to sustain their action. In the meantime they are tearing up the Bill of Rights and destroying the essential elements of free government."

In this view the Socialist Party concurs in its official protest against the recent Federal raids, issued on January 3, *before* the Albany attack upon the socialist assemblymen:

"If this raiding is permitted against even the most radical section of the labor movement, the authorities, drunk with power, will inevitably level their next attack upon the less radical dissenting groups, until it becomes an offense in the eyes of the administration to hold any opinion or to advocate any political or economic doctrine except that held by the ruling parties."

The Dark Forces

That there is a widespread campaign to destroy all radicalism and even average trade unionism behind all of these hysterical nation-wide raids can no longer be doubted. A hundred straws show the way the wind is blowing.

"The raids," says a Chicago dispatch to the *N. Y. Sun* "were the results of carefully matured plans laid by Chicago merchants, bankers, and business men, aided by the State Attorney's office, which had for the objective ridding the city of the radical menace. The group of business leaders has been meeting weekly for the last five months to discuss the activities of the Red leaders in plotting to disrupt industry and eventually to overthrow the government."

A new group of "captains of industry" known as the United Americans has been under formation for some while. Among its officers are found such world-famous industrial magnates as Daniel Willard, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad; H. H.

Westinghouse of the Westinghouse Air Brake Co.; Allen Walker, manager of the foreign trade bureau of the Guaranty Trust Co.; M. L. Requa, vice-president of the Sinclair Oil Co.; Otto Kahn of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; John H. Kirby, president of the National Lumbermen's Association, and Milo D. Campbell, president of the National Milk Producers Association. The United Americans are definitely non-political. Their preliminary organization was effected at *Chicago* on June 11, 1919, with delegations present from north- and middle-western states, each from some group "set up to resist the combination of radical elements making appeals to farmers in behalf of socialistic state governments . . . this being spread on the wings of Townley's Nonpartisan League. Eastern men at the conference had given more particular attention to the radical propaganda that was being directed toward industrial workers. . . . " *N. Y. Times,* December 28.) This organization is working through definite subgroups in each state. The general secretary, asked if labor would be represented in the committees, denied that it had a place on the National Committee, "as a labor leader would not represent all the people of the state, and therefore some big, upstanding man has been selected, . . . " a naïveté of view too delicious for comment.

The general strike in Winnipeg and Seattle, the Farmers' Nonpartisan League, race riots in Arkansas, Chicago, and Washington, D. C., "unsound sentiment among individual professors and teachers," parlor bolsheviks, one and all are looked upon as movements to be combated by this "non-political" but immensely powerful industrial group. (*N. Y. Times,* January 4.)

In the west the "dark forces" are more blatant in their efforts. In November, 1919, there appeared in the *Business Chronicle* of Seattle, Wash., an article entitled "The Thing—The Cause—The Cure." Speaking of the Centralia affair it declared:

"The I. W. W., the Nonpartisan League, the so-called Triple Alliance in the state of Washington [farmers, railroadmen, and union labor], the pro-German socialists, the closed shop labor unions . . . the whole motley crew of bolshevists and near-bolshevists, must be outlawed by public opinion and hunted down and hounded until driven beyond the horizon of civic decency. . . . The whole labor movement is putrid; its rottenness taints the atmosphere of every industrial centre. . . . The closed shop must be forever crushed in America. . . . The *Seattle Union Record* is the official organ of the Central Labor Council and its 137 affiliated unions and of the State Federation of Labor. It is organized labor's official voice in the Pacific Northwest. . . . Public policy requires that this mouthpiece of applied anarchy cease to exist!" (*N. Y. Call,* November 28.)

It is not surprising to find that, by a sweeping decision at Spokane, Wash., Supreme Court Judge Webster made permanent a temporary injunction forbidding membership in the I. W. W. or advocacy of its principles. It now becomes contempt of court in Washington state to affiliate with, advocate the principles of, or in any way advertise the Industrial Workers of the World. (*N. Y. Times* January 4.) Plainly this is but the thin end of the wedge.[1]

Agents Provocateurs?

Finally the actual methods used by the Department of Justice agents recall forcibly the secret police and agent provocateur of the Czar's régime. The public might be forgiven for taking with a pinch of salt the allegations of Santeri Nuorteva, secretary of the Russian Soviet Bureau, when he declares: (1) that Department of Justice agents had gone so far as to insert planks in the Communist Party platform so that that organization could be prosecuted; (2) that the Secret Service men had helped "plant" the recent alleged Red "bomb plots." (*N. Y. Times,* January 7.) The allegation takes on a much graver hue, however, when one learns that Senator Hardwick, a victim of one of the "bomb plots," is acting as counsel to Nuorteva's leader L. C. A. K. Martens, and

[1] *The New Majority* (organ of the Labor Party of the United States) reports that the Chicago branches of the cigar makers', the milk drivers', the waiters', and the amalgamated clothing workers' unions were raided. A woman reading *The New Majority* was arrested and told the Labor Party itself would be raided! (*N. Y. Call,* January 16.)

when so conservative and respectable a journal as the *New York Times* (January 3) carries the following assertion on its front pages:

"For months Department of Justice men, *dropping all other work,* had concentrated on the Reds. Agents quietly infiltrated into the radical ranks, slipped casually into centres of agitation, and went to work sometimes as cooks in remote mining colonies, sometimes as miners, again as steel workers, *and where the opportunity presented itself as 'agitators' of the wildest type. . . .* several of the agents, 'undercover' men, managed to rise in the radical movement and become, in at least one instance, *the recognized leader of a district.*" (Italics ours.)

This method has been used frequently—in the Lawrence strikes and in Seattle—by private industrial corporations in the past. Is it now actually being employed by the United States government itself?

Panic Legislation

Summary of the present anti-Red agitation would be incomplete without mention of the many state and federal bills and acts for the suppression of "sedition," radicalism, etc. Apart from large appropriations to the Department of Justice for the specific purpose of curbing radicalism, the House of Representatives passed before Christmas recess a bill to exclude or deport "aliens who entertain, advise, advocate, or teach" or are in any way members of any group "that entertains, advises, advocates, or teaches (1) *disbelief in* or opposition to all organized government," (2) the overthrow by force or violence of the United States government, (3) the killing of any officer of the United States government *or of any other organized government,* (4) "unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (5) sabotage." The same bill makes it a similar offense for an alien to write, edit, or circulate, display, or *have in one's possession* for display any written or printed matter containing views above mentioned. The giving, lending, or promising of money to such groups is also an offense. Representative Albert Johnson, Chairman of the Immigration Committee, in reporting this bill declared: "Free press in the United States is *ours not theirs;* free speech is *ours not theirs.*" (Italics ours.) Representative Johnson shows that the bill is meant to "get" the I. W. W. members—who to a western senator seem quite as bad as the Bolsheviki! (*N. Y. Times,* December 21.) The *raison d'être* of such a bill he explained as follows: "The enlargement of the terms and definitions of existing law seem necessary for the reason that while agents of the Department of Justice as well as agents of the Bureau of Immigration have made and are making arrests of aliens, *the Secretary of Labor has made decisions which render such arrests futile.*" (Italics ours.) (*N. Y. Times,* December 17.)

While many states already have, as a product of war-time sentiment, "anti-anarchy" or "anti-sedition" acts on their statute books, including such large industrial states as New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Washington, the national legislators seem to feel the call for yet more drastic measures of suppression. Hence the Graham bill, which includes Attorney General Palmer's original draft, and Senator Sterling's measure. This measure includes the death penalty among its punishments (for any death resulting from anti-governmental activity), closes the mails and express companies to "seditious" literature, prohibits the red flag, and denies the right of a person to refuse to give testimony on the ground that it might incriminate him. Two press comments on the bill—already passed through the Senate—suffice:

"If at a political meeting called to discuss legislative or constitutional changes a disturbance occurs and some one is injured, it will be easy under this act to ascribe 'intent' to the sponsors of the meeting and hold them for treason, for which the punishment is death." (*N. Y. Call,* January 8.)

"With such a law in force, political controversy as always carried on in this country, labor strikes as usually conducted, challenging the laws believed to be unconstitutional, and heated disputes between vociferous individuals may easily be brought under its drag-net clauses. We have here definitions of treason unknown to the Constitution. Riot, assault and battery, and disorderly conduct are set down as sedition, and contempt of court is made a felony. Assemblage, speech and press, no longer guaranteed, are habit-

ually subject to a raid. In every instance all that is necessary to establish these weird proceedings is an allegation that somebody is attempting to overthrow the government by violence—crime contemplated, not crime accomplished." (*N. Y. World.*)

Conclusion

War has created a shortage of four million workers; some three hundred thousand immigrants may be expected to arrive on our shores in the coming year, but over one million desire to return to Europe. America, according to Gen. T. Coleman du Pont is already short over two millions of unskilled (foreign born) laborers. "Native workmen do not perform the common labor, and our industries are dependent upon immigration for this work." (*N. Y. Times,* January 1.) On the other hand, Attorney General Palmer declares there are over 60,000 "Reds" in this country who presumably should be deported—How to encourage both immigration and emigration at one and the same time; that is the dilemma of the authorities! Meanwhile no less an authority than Judge George W. Anderson of Massachusetts can declare:

"Many, perhaps most, of the agitators for the suppression of the so-called 'red' menace are, I observe, the same individuals or class of forces that in 1917 and 1918 were frightening the community to death over pro-German plots. Now, I assert as my best judgment that more than 99 per cent. of the pro-German plots never existed.

"I doubt that the 'Red' menace has more basis in fact than the pro-German peril.

"There are 'Reds', probably there are dangerous 'Reds.' But they are not half so dangerous as the prating pseudo-patriots who under the guise of Americanism are preaching murder and shooting at sunrise, and to whom our church parlors and other public forums have hitherto been open." (*N. Y. Tribune,* January 14.)

W. H. C.

Victor L. Berger

The fight against the suspension of the five socialist assemblymen has obscured the no less important case of the expulsion of Victor L. Berger from the House of Representatives. The facts in this case are significant.

In the November elections of 1918, Mr. Berger, who had previously served (1910-1912) as America's first socialist Congressman, was reëlected to Congress from the fifth Milwaukee District by a majority of 5,560 votes over Joseph P. Carney, Democrat, his opponent. On February 20, 1919, Berger was sentenced to a term of twenty years in prison, together with four others, for conspiracy to obstruct the armed forces of the United States. The indictment against Berger was based on his connection with the war proclamation of the party and on the publication in *The Milwaukee Leader* of five editorials, in part, as follows:

The Berger Attacks

(1) "Why We Are in This War." This editorial declared that America had entered the war in order to benefit munitions profiteers and owners of industrial stocks, to discourage labor troubles, and to assist in the development of autocracy and militarism in this country. Finally, "Germany's commercial success requires that Germany be extinguished. . . . As for democracy? We can not force any special form of government upon Germany any more than we could have forced it upon Russia. The German people will have to do that for themselves."

(2) "War and Insanity." This editorial quoted a speaker before the Alienists and Neurologists of America as declaring that, "in the present war, the number [of insane] not infrequently reaches 40 to the 1,000 men. . . . Think of it! An army of 1,000,000 men might have 40,000 insane." The editorial, in commenting on this speech, stated that capitalism was gradually driving the people insane, and added, "and now the supreme horror of capitalism—war—multiplies these numbers many-fold. . . . In my judgment those who want to end the horrors are the real genuine patriots."

(3) "Difference of Opinion." The editorial under the above caption, in commenting on the statement frequently found in the newspapers, "it is an honor to be drafted," asserted that young men of draft age did not seem to have that point of view. "The question they ask is, 'Did you escape?' Or, 'Were you caught?' These and questions of similar tenor are the ones you can hear if you mingle with the young men."

(4) "A Big Business War." "It is a business

man's war, and the object is profits, not democracy."

(5) "Censoring God." The fifth editorial commented on the extraordinary sale of Bibles, adding: "The Bible is treasonable nowadays. It says, 'Thou shalt not kill.' . . . But our latter-day commercial and political saints . . . have amended the commandment by striking out the word 'not' so as to make it read, 'Thou shalt kill'." The editorial further suggested that the commandment, "That ye love one another," etc. be gouged out of the Bible, together with that sentence in the beatitudes which says, "Blessed are the peacemakers."

Trial Pronounced Unfair

Mr. Cochems, the lawyer for Mr. Berger, in referring to the trial resulting in Mr. Berger's conviction, stated to the House Committee that the prosecution was conducted in a manner eminently unfair to the defendant; that unproved implications were continually woven into the case by the opposition attorneys; that Berger's writings and speeches ever since 1900 were brought in to bolster up the case against him, and that the court had refused to allow the defense to introduce any testimony regarding the defendant's activities since March 1, 1918, while the prosecution admitted evidence of articles written subsequently to this time. He continued:

"In the very closing of that trial, they [the prosecution] read the Wuori letter, which is a letter containing a remittance of $10, in which Mr. Berger said, 'I admire your class spirit.' They did not read the part in which Mr. Berger said: 'I am against your syndicalism and your sabotage, as emphatically as ever, but I send you $10 to help you get a defense.'"

While permitting, over objection, the reading of an article on the I. W. W. written by an editorial writer of *The Leader* on September 17, 1917, Judge Landis refused to admit evidence regarding the attitude of *The Leader* subsequent to this date. Mr. Cochems continued:

"At the time when Judge Landis permitted these things to go in—in the last hour of the trial, on Saturday—there was an official report on the way from the adjutant general's office, which was a contradiction of their statement in which they had tried to make it appear that Milwaukee was the leading city in desertions and delinquencies, while we knew very well that the opposite was true; that Milwaukee was one of the best cities in the whole country in carrying out all the war measures of the government. . . . But the jury went to the jury box believing this man, Victor Berger, had in the city of Milwaukee caused wholesale desertions and delinquencies."[1]

After conviction by a jury composed of insurance brokers, wealthy retired farmers, and two bankers, Judge Landis imposed a sentence of twenty years' hard labor in the Leavenworth penitentiary, and Judge Altshuler fixed the bail at $100,000![2]

The case was appealed and the Circuit Court of Appeals from the Seventh District decided to hear the case on February 19, 1920. After the decision is rendered by this court, the case may be brought before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Further Persecution

During the war, all first-class mail addressed to *The Milwaukee Leader* was seized, and this practice continued after the armistice, while letters addressed to Berger at the *Leader* office were continually returned to the sender with the announcement that they were undeliverable.

"I may address a letter to the crown prince in Holland, to Ludendorff in Berlin, or to Hindenburg," asserted Lawyer Cochems before the House Committee, "and the postmaster will deliver it, but he will not deliver it to *The Milwaukee Leader*."

The Leader was also excluded from second-class privileges, and, according to the sworn statement of the business manager of

[1]Several witnesses testified during the trial that Berger had advised them to go to war if drafted. Carl Haessler declared: "I told him [Berger] that I was not going to accept service and he said: 'Carl, you had better put on the uniform. You will only get in jail if you don't and a socialist in jail is of no use to the movement. We want you on the outside.'" (Hearings before the Special Committee, etc., Vol. 2, page 460.)

[2]Mr. Cochems: "On the election and composition of the jury, I want to say that out of a panel that was examined of fully 50 there was only one laboring man who appeared out of a 90% population of that judicial district, in the panel, and he was promptly treated as though he was a spy in camp. . . . Racially it [the jury] was utterly unrepresentative."

The Leader, the loss for the first six months approximated $400,000. "We lost," declared Berger, "17,600 mail subscribers over night by not being in a position to use the mails. . . . Instead of paying one cent per pound we had to pay ten cents per pound for mailing *The Milwaukee Leader." The Commonwealth,* a weekly subsequently issued to supply out-of-town readers, was also left in the post office undelivered, although the department accepted the postage therefor.

When Congressman Berger presented himself to the House of Representatives, one of the Congressmen objected to having him seated, on the ground that he was ineligible, and a committee was appointed to hear the case. After a long-drawn-out hearing the committee urged that he be not seated, and, on November 11, 1919, the House, with but one dissenting vote, that of Voight of Wisconsin, excluded Berger.

A special election was ordered for December 19,1919, by the Governor of Wisconsin. The Republicans and Democrats of the district fused forces and nominated H. H. Bodenstab as their candidate, the Socialist Party renominated Berger. The contest was the most bitter ever waged in that district. The German paper, the *Herold,* appealed to all good German-Americans to vote for their "*Stammgenossen* (compatriot) Heinrich Bodenstab" and against Berger. High prelates, politicians, from all parts of the union, urged a fight against him on the ground that he was un-American. The Russian issue was brought prominently into the foreground. Despite intense opposition, the socialist vote was increased by 7,983 over that of 1918, Berger receiving 25,802 to 19,800 for his opponent.

In the face of this reiterated desire on the part of the people of the district to have Berger as their representative, Congress again decided, on January 10, 1920, to refuse him a seat. This time six Congressmen voted in his favor, including Republican Floor Manager James R. Mann, General Isaac Sherwood of Ohio, Voight of Wisconsin, Griffin of New York, Sisson of Missouri, and Harrold of Oklahoma. Congressman Mann, during the debate, said in part:

"I do not share Berger's political views, but in his demand for fundamental changes in our institutions he is supported by many American voters. His constituents want him here. It is our duty to accept him here. The way it is proposed to exclude him from Congress is a violation of democratic government. When we, in meeting the argument of Berger, and his supporters, resort ourselves to force, it is a confession that we are losing strength."

The House howled down the motion to allow Berger ten minutes to state his position.

"If frank opposition to war is treason," declared Berger, after the vote was taken, "then Sumner, Clay, Webster, and Lincoln were traitors, and those American heroes went further than I did in their criticism, for they were active leaders of the opposition in the midst of war. In earlier years David Lloyd George was this kind of traitor, for he violently opposed the Boer War and was mobbed by Tory hirelings for his stand. . . .

"I am accused of calling the late war a capitalist war. If that is a crime, then Woodrow Wilson ought to share my twenty-year sentence, because he said the same thing in September of last year.[1]

"I have been acquitted by a jury of 25,000 men in a congressional district where the percentage of illiteracy is less than one-half of one per cent., the very lowest in the country."

Berger Renominated

Within an hour after the House voted again to unseat Berger, the Socialist Party Central Committee in Milwaukee announced his renomination. This statement was followed by a statement from Governor Phillips of Wisconsin that he would not call another special election because of the expense involved. The socialists will doubtless attempt to run Berger again at the time of the spring elections.

Oswald Garrison Villard, in commenting on the unseating of Victor Berger, drew attention to the fact that Mr. Berger was

[1]On September 5. 1919, at St. Louis, President Wilson is quoted as stating: 'Peace? Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here or woman who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? This war was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war."

looked upon as a right-wing member of the party, and that "he has been denounced within his party many times during the past years for ultra-conservatism. If the government were wise it would not be persecuting men of this type of mind, but be encouraging them to pour oil upon the waters and to preach the doctrine of peaceful revolution."[1]

Mr. Villard continued:

"Many of these people see that there is a deep underlying principle involved in the Berger case, one that has made it of national importance. That is the right of a Congressional district to select its representative and have him seated. Congress has established a most dangerous precedent in barring Mr. Berger because of its dislike of his opinions as to the war and the future constitution of society. If Mr. Berger is again unseated in the face of this vote by his constituents the House of Representatives will have laid down the rule that in a case where no question of fraud or illegal election has arisen it has the right to say what man shall or shall not represent the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin. It is evident that this district will reëlect Mr. Berger as often as may be necessary, if he desires to keep up the fight, and that the net result may be that this district will be without voice in the Congress of the United States, unless Congress abides by the sound precedent it established when Matthew Lyon of Vermont, who served a prison sentence while a member of Congress, was finally seated on reëlection. . . .

That the whole proceeding is against "the historical traditions of the country" was the contention of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. It declared:

"Daniel Webster, Thaddeus Stevens, and Abraham Lincoln were among those who denounced and condemned the war against Mexico. The Democratic party adopted a platform in 1864, which, if the Espionage Act had been enacted, would have placed all its prominent leaders in jail. The Democratic party also adopted a platform in 1900 denouncing conscription. It affirmed that all the civil rights of the citizens would be destroyed with the adoption of conscription and a policy of imperialism. Mr. Berger is to be tried before his colleagues in Congress for writing and saying what his opponents wrote and said on many occasions before this war.

"We protest that the procedure is unprecedented in another respect. The civil war created passions and hatreds that required a generation to quell. In contests coming before Congress during the reconstruction period a large number related to men who had openly expressed their opposition to the war. Some had even expressed their sympathy with the rebellion. Senators Trumbull and Sumner endeavored a number of times to secure the expulsion of representatives-elect on the ground that they had opposed the war and 'aided the enemy.' Yet notwithstanding that some of the accused were known to have even expressed sympathy with the rebellion, Congress refused to unseat any member unless an overt act against the Union was admitted or proved."

In Italy several of the 156 socialist deputies when elected in November, 1919, were actually serving prison sentences because of their militant anti-war activities, and practically all of the candidates had expressed, in one way or the other, their opposition of war. No effort was made to exclude them from membership in the Chamber of Deputies.

In "benighted, monarchistic" Spain, Señors Besteiro, Caballero, Anguiano, and Saborit were serving their terms under life sentence for alleged participation in a general strike, when, in the spring of 1918, they were elected to the Cortes on the socialist ticket. Following their election, instead of excluding them from the body, the Federal Parliament granted them complete amnesty, even restoring to Professor Julian Besteiro his professorship in the University of Madrid, and the four were escorted to Madrid from Santa Barbara prison in triumph.

Many socialists who had fought against the government during the war have of late been elected to the parliaments of France, England, Germany, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, in fact in practically every warring country outside of the United States, with the exception of Japan, and yet not a move has been made to deprive the citizens electing them of the right to choose their own representatives. Only in the United States, which has so long boasted of leadership in representative government, do we find the majority parties daring to dictate to local communities what kind of men they shall choose. H. W. L.

[1]See *The Nation*, December 27, 1919. William English Walling, a few years ago, was wont to refer to Mr. Berger as a mere "reformist," as contrasted with a revolutionist. (*Socialism As It Is*, p. 211, and in numerous other works.)

The Committee of Forty-Eight

John Haynes Holmes

It was while our train was crossing the Mississippi River, on Tuesday, December 9, that I learned from a chance newspaper that the Committee of Forty-eight had been forbidden to hold its convention at the Hotel Statler, in St. Louis. Some unidentified American Legion members, eager to protect the country from assassination and bloodshed, had threatened to break up the Committee's meeting; the Department of Justice, as nervous as a school-girl at midnight, had started investigation; the local hotel manager, not uninfluenced by local political forces, had become disturbed; and the edict of banishment was issued.

It was an indignant crowd of delegates which I met on my arrival at the Statler, sternly resolved to fight for American rights of speech and assembly to the bitter end. Fortunately, this bitter end was never reached, for that morning saw a rapid clearing of the tangled situation. The American Legion disavowed the action of its self-chosen officious representatives; the manager of the Statler Corporation, appealed to by wire in New York, repudiated the action of his local representative; a judge, applied to for an injunction, granted it at once; the St. Louis newspapers, without a single exception, rallied to our support; and almost before we knew it, the ban was lifted. At two o'clock in the afternoon, the full convention assembled for permanent organization; and nothing was left of the disturbance but an uneasy suspicion that we had won our victory because St. Louis was impressed not so much by our appeal to liberty as by our proof of respectability. Suppose we had worn soft collars, had had no five thousand dollars for that bond, and had been an I. W. W. or even a Non-Partisan League convention! Would we have gained our permission to meet so easily, or perhaps at all?

A Variety of Delegates

The assembling of the convention disclosed a remarkable group of people. More than three hundred delegates from over thirty States of the Union were present, and a large and changing representation of citizens from St. Louis and surrounding Missouri towns. I had feared that the meeting might be predominantly "high-brow" in character—enemies of the Committee had denounced it as a movement of the kid-glove, silk-stocking *intelligentzia;* but nothing of the sort was true of this first "gathering of the clans." If ever there was a typical American audience, this was it. Bankers, lawyers, publicists, clergymen from New York and other cities in the East—business men and farmers from the Middle West—Non-Partisan Leaguers from the far Northwest—capitalists and trade unionists—socialists, single-taxers, and old-time populists—politicians with long records of service in Republican or Democratic ranks—professors, young college students, women—soldiers from the war in France, conscientious objectors from prison—Negroes, Jews,—all were represented. Among the speakers I distinctly recall a New York lawyer active in I. W. W. and anarchist cases, a wealthy business man from the East, a distinguished minister from Ohio, a coal-miner, a farmer's wife from a little town in the wilds of Montana, a public lecturer from Massachusetts, a Washington newspaper correspondent, an official of the Non-Partisan League, a negro clergyman, a Hindu student, etc. As I listened, I thought inevitably of the tradition and spirit of the New England Town Meeting. At every session, spies of the Department of Justice were present in eager watch for sedition, but democracy was triumphant all the same.

The heterogeneous character of the assembly seemed for a time to bode ill for the fulfillment of its purposes. One of its best features was the absence of any slightest suggestion of strong, dominating leadership. There was present no one man, or group of men, who, by temper, ability, or design,

threatened to "grasp" the convention

". . . with hands of steel

(And) bend what shall be to their will."

The assembly was too democratic in spirit to recognize any such central autocracy, even had it appeared. But for this very reason was there danger of futility and failure. Behind the whole idea of the first convention was the desire to discover through discussion a consensus of independent opinion on the pressing issues of the day, and fashion this into a rallying-cry and platform for the presidential campaign of 1920. Here were all sorts and conditions of men, most of them staunchly individualistic in their thought, all of them with clear-cut *idées fixes* of fundamental change, for which they were quite ready to "fight, bleed, and die." How was it going to be possible to bring unity out of this diversity, order out of this chaos?

The Platform

It was with foreboding that I took my seat in the Committee on Platform, to begin the hearings. This gloom deepened, as man after man, each with his favorite panacea, argued with ability and fine sincerity. Then little by little began to appear that spirit of vision and concord, partly the inheritance of true Americanism, but more the new creation of the stern exigencies of the times, which was destined to seize the convention and mould it into one great purpose of revolt. The platform must be short, it must search no final causes and seek no ultimate remedies, it must be captured by no sectarian or class philosophies, it must not wander far afield in pursuit of all the evils that vex mankind! On the contrary, it must keep strictly to the business in hand, which is the political and economic crisis in this country; and set forth with unmistakable clarity what is to be done, and can be done, in 1920, by the organized endeavor of all who seek the restoration of governmental control to the hands of the people! The result, after long hours of deliberation, was the following platform, of unexampled brevity and definiteness, adopted by unanimous vote:

"1. Public ownership of transportation, including stock yards, large abbatoirs, grain elevators, terminal warehouses, pipe lines and tanks. Public ownership of other public utilties and of the principal natural resources, such as coal, oil, natural gas, mineral deposits, large water powers, and large commercial lumber tracts.

"2. No land (including natural resources) and no patents to be held out of use for speculation or to aid monopoly. We favor taxes to force idle land into use.

"3. Equal economic, political, and legal rights for all, irrespective of sex or color. The immediate and absolute restoration of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly, and all civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. We demand the abolition of injunctions in labor cases. We endorse the effort of labor to share in the management of industry and labor's right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing."

The defects of this platform are obvious—it offers no thoroughgoing analysis of present evils and their origin, carries nothing through to ultimate conclusions, brings together a set of ill-related and incomplete reforms. But equally obvious are the merits of this platform—a statement of immediate and far-reaching social changes, upon which all progressive minds can agree as "first steps" in any journey toward final goals, and a statement of these in concise and understandable form for use in the campaign just ahead.

Other issues, ruled out of the platform, were treated in resolution. Thus, the convention demanded that Congress "should not declare war or the existence of a state of war unless authorized by vote of the people, except in case of invasion by force"; declared against universal military training; called for the lifting of the blockade against Russia at once; asked the immediate release of "political prisoners and all imprisoned in violation of their constitutional right of free speech"; and urged that "our government should make every effort to secure universal disarmament by international agreement."

Not a Third Party

The second problem facing the convention was that of political procedure. Contrary to what seems to be a very general impression, the Committee of Forty-eight had no intention at this or any other meeting of

forming a new third party of its own. On the contrary, it definitely desired to avoid this, to the end of assisting in the creation of a genuine all-inclusive third party, to which all men, of all walks of life, and all schools of thought other than the reactionary standpattism of both the Republican and Democratic parties can rally in 1920. The Committee realized that it was perhaps the smallest, although by no means the least influential, of the many groups now seeking to create an opposition which shall seriously threaten and finally break the hold of the autocratic two-party system of this country. To this end, the Committee did nothing to cut itself off from coöperation with the Non-Partisan League, the Labor Party of the United States, the Socialists, etc. On the contrary, it mapped out a program of political procedure looking to the formation of close associations with these groups, and the holding of a convention "not later than July, 1920," in which it is hoped that a great third party may be born.

The St. Louis convention was a success. It organized triumphantly that great body of intelligent liberal sentiment in America, which has turned forever from the two old parties, and formed as yet no new alignments. It opened the way, in platform and program, for the coöperation of these liberals with the more radical labor and farmer groups already in the field. It made the best contribution yet offered to the crystallization of issues in the campaign just ahead. Above all, it gave expression to the true spirit of America.

In North Dakota

A. B. Gilbert

The special session of the North Dakota legislature, in December, 1919, was plainly indicative of one thing—that the legislators, despite desertions by some of the state officers, were still intent on the program of reform for which that state is now famous.

Following the regular session of the legislature,[1] three of the state officers elected on the farmer-labor ticket,—the attorney general, the auditor, and the secretary of state—turned against the priciples of the Nonpartisan League, and it was freely predicted by the opposition that "The New Day" would fail in the special session. The farmer legislature, however, not only remained loyal to the New Day, but added to the industrial legislation in many important ways.[2]

The Coal Mines

Of perhaps chief national interest during the session was Governor Frazier's action in taking over the coal mines of the state during the recent crisis. Despite bitter protests in the hostile press and in the courts, this action was sustained by the legislature. A new law was also passed which empowers the governor *"to take over and operate any coal mines or other public utility in any emergency where necessary for the protection of life and property."* While the governor already had this power, this law is valuable as an indorsement by the representatives of the people.

During the entire strike period the coal mines were open and working under Frazier's

---

*In the preceding regular session, several important measures were passed. These included:

(1) A State Hail Insurance Law. Under this law, a flat tax of three cents an acre is levied on farm land in general, including the speculator's idle land, and enough more on cultivated land to pay the losses of the insured up to $7 an acre. Every farmer is automatically insured, unless he protests. The chief overhead expenses of hail insurance are thus eliminated, and the farmer obtains his insurance for half-price.

(2) A Central Bank Law. A central bank was established by the legislature, which is freeing the state from dependence on the private banks of the Twin Cities. The state banks can clear through it, and are using it to the extent of $1,000,000 a day. The central bank can lend money to the state banks in the same manner as does the federal reserve bank in the national system. It is made the repository of all public funds and is open for deposits from private citizens. It is intended to finance the state industries which otherwise would

direction and the miners worked at the old terms, trusting the governor to do the right thing in any future adjustment that might be made. Frazier's action was sustained by a federal district judge, enjoined by a state court judge who talked wildly of anarchy and civil war, and pronounced illegal by the state supreme court. The last decision is interesting in that the deciding vote was cast by a ninety-year-old judge who was also indiscreet enough to write the opinion! This judge decided against the governor, not on the merits of the case in court, but on his general belief that the state was coddling labor to too great an extent.

In spite of these attempts to keep the mines idle and while Governor Allen of Kansas was working out his approved plan of state operation with volunteer labor, the regular miners in North Dakota went steadily ahead digging coal. The Kansas governor paid his volunteers more than the trained miners were getting, but, despite these terms, it would probably be an exaggeration to say that the Kansas miners yielded enough coal to warm the state's public buildings. The mines of North Dakota are now being returned, inasmuch as the Washington agreement removes the cause of the governor's action.

Taxation

The false cry of high taxation raised by the opposition, and particularly by the turncoat state officials, was met with poetic justice. Appropriations made by the regular session for their officers were drastically cut. The attorney general, for instance, as a result finds himself with only two assistants instead of seven; much of his work is to be taken over by a new officer, the state sheriff; and the governor is given power and funds to appoint lawyers who will defend the state laws in court.

The Nonpartisan League members in general were disappointed because the legislature did not impeach these officers, but the citizen frequently fails to realize that the

---

be placed at the mercy of the anti-farmer bankers, and it possesses $10,000,000 to loan to farmers on first-class mortgages on terms similar to those offered by the federal farm loan bank.

The banking law also contains a provision for seasonal loans. A new law provides that loans can be made on warehouse receipts for farm produce. The farmer can thus keep his produce off the glutted fall market and at the same time secure money for his fall bills. When the state gets its system of elevators, local warehouses, and local cold storage plants well under way, there will be abundant space for this storage.

(3) State Milling Law. Under this law farmers can send samples of their wheat to the state before they sell, and can thus find out what the grade should be. When the elevator manager tries undergrading, the taking of dockage for nothing and false weighing, the state grain inspector is present to check up. The manager either makes good to the mistreated farmer or the elevator goes out of business.

In time the state will possess a system of state-owned elevators and mills. The management for this purpose has been appointed, the funds appropriated, and one mill at Drake is already in operation.

(4) The state industrial commission was given power to enter the meat packing industry.

(5) Farm land improvements will pay no further taxes, but the rural sections will still yield their fair share of taxes. This means that the owner of idle land must either pay more taxes or improve his holding. Farm implements, machinery, and city improvements, are exempt to the value of $1,000.

(6) The legislature provided for a home building association.

(7) Many other new measures were passed along the following lines: Insurance of workmen against accidents taken out of private hands and conducted at cost by the state with the most liberal awards known in the Union; a state income tax laying heavier burdens on unearned than on earned incomes; $25 a month for returned soldiers; home rule for cities, with permission to own their own utilities; child labor really prohibited; an eight-hour day for women; a motor vehicle tax graduated according to the value of the car; newspapers for public advertising to be chosen by the voters; minimum wage for women; reduction of freight rates.

[2] Perhaps the difference in comparative loyalty between state officers and legislators may be explained by the fact that the legislators are nominated and elected by voters who know them personally, whereas the state nominations are necessarily given to men who are generally known and consequently pretty much unknown quantities.

worst offenses may not be crimes in the sight of the law.[3]

Building and Loan Plans

Of particular interest to the farmers of the state was the appropriation of $2,000,000 to the state building association for the purpose of pushing forward its work of building town houses and ready-made farms on the general building and loan plan. The enactment of the law for such an association in the preceding session of the legislature gave rise to a widespread demand for this state service, not only on account of the lack of building due to war conditions, but also because of the virtually prohibitive interest rates and prices on commercial construction material. The state is empowered to acquire land, to build and to give loans up to 80% of the value of the property.

The Farmer's Vote

Through an extension of the absent voter's law, North Dakota now becomes the first state to give the farmer an equal opportunity to vote with the city man. A special election for state senator, in which more than 200 farmers were kept from the polls by a severe snow storm, occurred a week before the special session, and made the need of such action especially apparent. By the terms of the act, any voter living more than a half mile from his polling place, may apply for an absent voter's ballot within thirty days of the election. The remainder of the plan is similar to other laws for absent voters. The measure, it is expected, will be of more value to the farmer's wives than to the farmers themselves.

The national woman suffrage amendment was passed, as well as a law providing for investigation of false rumors started for the purpose of injuring the financial credit of the state.

The Cow Purchase Law

If North Dakota were not a radical state, our advocates of diversified farming would find one law of the special session worthy of great praise—the cow purchase act. The western part of the state is subject to drought periods in which most of the grain crops are lost and the farmers are stranded. When this occurs, all business in the section is stopped, with the possible exception of that of the foreclosure shark. Two years ago the legislature empowered counties to issue bonds for the purpose of buying feed and seed, which, in turn, were to be loaned to needy farmers.

This session a farmer senator from the drought area came forward with a bill to help these farmers to secure cows. This farmer had weathered three drought years through the income obtained from his herd and was consequently legislating from experience. His bill, now a law, gives counties the power, on the petition of 50 freeholders, to issue bonds with a view to purchasing cows for distribution among farmers. Farmers who need the cows must form local associations of ten or more. Not more than five cows are allotted to any one farmer. A plan of gradual payment is provided and each member is liable for ten per cent. more than the amount of his personal obligation. The cows are to be good grade stock purchased through the state department of agriculture.

"Free Love" and Bolshevism

No story of this special session would be complete without reference to the "free love" furore raised by some anti-farmer legislators. Farmers in general do not share as yet the views of the average city man on freer divorce, and to find their loyal state officers directly accused of being love pirates was indeed a sensation. The proof of the piracy was the discovery that the state library had purchased Ellen Key's book, *Love and Marriage,* a book found, perhaps, in every city library in the United States! The earlier administration had purchased all except one

[3] Contrary to the practice in nearly every other civilized state, we in America place ourselves at the mercy of administrative officers for definite calendar periods. What they do or do not do in this period is a matter of conscience rather than of legal regulation. The cabinet system with state administrators directly responsible to the legislature can certainly be recommended to any state with New Day aspirations.

of Ellen Key's books, principally because the Scandinavians form so large a part of the population of the state and this book completed the list.

The discoverer of the piracy also found bolshevism rampant because of John Spargo's *Bolshevism,* but his spirit suffered much when a farmer legislator read the subtitle showing that the book was hostile to the Soviet Government.

The librarian intended *Love and Marriage* for circulation only among adults. The anti-farmer papers of the state, however, showed their great regard for the sanctity of the home by publishing long extracts from what a conservative would regard as the worst parts of the book in order to prove how bad the love pirates were. Thanks to them Ellen Key's books have received great advertising and are bound in years to come to have considerable influence on the thinking of the people.[4]

Changing Conceptions of the State

Jessie Wallace Hughan

Up to the Great War the radical movement had troubled itself very little with the nature of the state *per se.* Social reform accepted the present state; syndicalism assumed its automatic disappearance with the proletarian seizure of production; anarchism was generally recognized as an unattainable counsel of perfection; and socialists, confident of the essential harmony of industrial and political democracy, were willing, upon the whole, to leave the problem to the processes of economic evolution. The active energies of some groups were directed to the attainment of industrial control, of others to the securing of collectivism and political democracy. The demand for civil liberty was to all little more than an incident in the political and industrial struggle.

With the war, however, the emphasis abruptly changed. The state socialism of Germany, long viewed with suspicion by radicals, fell suddenly into general discredit. Even the German Social Democrats, by the acquiescence of their majority in the war, strengthened among international socialists the growing revulsion of feeling against efficient parliamentarianism.

Collectivism, on the other hand, became the policy of governments, and radicals of every type found themselves in collision with win-the-war state socialism. Political democracy was raised aloft as the slogan of the war, and in several countries actually made great leaps; yet no sooner was this democracy in a fair way of establishment than the working class rose in demand for a change even more radical.

At the same time the Western nations found that civil liberties, long considered by them as accomplished, were fast slipping away. Freedom of speech and assembly, assurance against unlawful search and unusual punishments, all went by the board, while the apotheosis of the state took precedence over all religion and ethics.

As a result of these war developments, we find a tendency among the younger radicals to take collectivism for granted, while pressing more vigorously the demand for industrial control. Furthermore, the dangers with which civil liberties are everywhere threatened, coupled with the distrust of the phrases of political democracy so generally utilized for the propaganda of empire, have brought about a searching inquiry into the nature of the state itself.

The Purpose of the State

What is the purpose of the state? What is its ultimate sanction? Can state sovereignty be reconciled with individual liberty? Following upon these questions are practical problems which penetrate no less deeply into the roots of society. Should the political state

[4] On January 16, 1920, most of the laws passed by the special session of N. D. legislature were declared unconstitutional by a four to one decision of the Supreme Court of North Dakota! (*N. Y. Times,* January 17.)

be based upon the geographical or the industrial group? In a conflict between the state and the individual conscience, which should be obeyed?

Of a half dozen books showing this newer trend nearly all are from British sources. An interesting series emanates from the group of radicals centering around Richard Roberts and Delisle Burns.[1] These little books are religious to a degree approaching the prophetic and contain magnificent passages which bring back in almost Miltonian fashion the Christian passion for freedom.

The sovereignty of the state is examined by these writers and found wanting. In its stead their allegiance is given to the Anglo-Saxon principle of individualism, the human personality being the end of the state and the individual conscience its ultimate sanction. As far as practical recommendations go, their tendency is strongly toward guild socialism, the dual organization of a political state of consumers and a functional state of producers as such, or still more broadly a federal state representing in its "upper house" not only labor unions, but churches, universities, and other permanent voluntary associations.

Further than this their recommendations are somewhat vague, appearing on the surface to differ little from Wilsonian liberalism.[2] We need to look further into the conduct of these thinkers during the Great War to find that their practical solution of the problem of conscience vs. state is the radical answer of passive resistance.

Why Freedom Matters

The characteristic of Norman Angell is to confront conditions, not theories, and we therefore find his "British Revolution and American Democracy" devoted ostensibly to a setting forth of the facts of the British situation with their expression in the Labor Party Manifesto.[3] In his final chapters, however, largely a reprint of essays struck off at the height of war censorship, Mr. Angell strikes far deeper than the measured appeal to present expediency, and gives a brilliant argument for minority freedom, for the sake not of the minority, but of the state itself.

While the text upon which his volume is a comment, the Labor Party Manifesto, marks little more than a crystallization of the older radicalism of industrial liberty, his own discussion, by its insistence upon the fundamentals of Anglo-Saxon freedom, constitutes a daring and radical attack upon the end-of-the-war apotheosis of government.

Bertrand Russell and the Guild System

As the underlying conclusion of Angell's book is the limitation of state sovereignty by freedom of minority expression, so the central idea of Bertrand Russell's *Proposed Roads to Freedom* is its limitation by the industrial independence of the guilds.[4] Yet Mr. Russell is far from considering the plural sovereignty of the guild system as sufficient in itself to secure freedom. "If, in spite of the safeguards proposed by the guild socialists, the guild congress became all-powerful in such questions,—I fear that the evils now connected with the omnipotence of the state would soon reappear. If this method is to be successful we must have not only suitable organizations but also a diffused respect for liberty, and an absence of submissiveness to government both in theory and practice."[5]

If a weakness exists in both Angell's and Russell's books, it lies in an apparent misunderstanding of social democracy as a political movement. In spite of Mr. Angell's careful treatment of the American Socialist Party and Mr. Russell's sympathetic analysis of Marxian ideas of the state, yet in their more general chapters both authors seem to forget their own modifications and to consider political and state socialism as synonymous.

An interesting corrective to this misunderstanding is found in two American documents, the Socialist Party Congressional Platform for 1918, and the draft for a new national

[1]Gilbert Cannan, *Freedom;* Richard Roberts, *The Church in the Commonwealth;* C. Delisle Burns, *The World of States.*

[2]Cannan, *Freedom,* Ch. 9.

[3]Norman Angell, *The British Revolution and American Oemocracy.* (Huebsch.)

[4]Bertrand Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom, Socialism, Anarchism, and Syndicalism.* (New York: Holt.)

[5]*Ibid.,* pp. 35-6.

constitution appended to Irwin St. John Tucker's lectures on Internationalism.[6] These concrete suggestions, while perhaps negligible as original contributions, yet show distinctly the emphasis upon industrial self-government and decentralization in present day political socialism.

Finally our attention is challenged by two books which deal directly and explicitly with the fundamental problem of authority in the state.

Organization by Function

De Maetzu brings to the enthusiastic support of the British guild socialism a mind of decidedly un-British type.[7] He combats the German idea of state sovereignty by means of characteristically German abstractions, but opposes at every point the British liberalism which makes the individual the end of the state. Pacifism and the conscientious objector he views with scorn. Personality, he maintains, is not the ultimate in life, but function the creation of objective good; therefore, the only just organization of the state must be functional, according, that is, to the principles of guild socialism.

Personality the Ultimate of the State

Harold Laski, on the other hand, while writing in America, yet speaks with the ripeness of British experience of the state.[8] Instead of Kant and Hegel, he quotes the authorities of constitutional law, and throughout the volume he keeps his feet on the solid ground of a large expediency.

In common with the others of the group, Laski sounds the knell of state sovereignty, and looks forward to some form of guild socialism in the future commonwealth. He differs from the typical guildsman, however, in placing his trust far less in plural sovereignty and the details of organization than in the supremacy of the individual conscience. He opposes De Maetzu directly in making not function, but personality, the end of the state, and the happiness of "humble men and women,"[9] the ultimate purpose of society, in which function is a mere incident. While De Maetzu, therefore, considers compulsion of the individual an essential of even the ideal state, Laski makes the conscientious objector the ultimate bulwark of a free society, and potential or actual resistance to the majority the only valid assurance against perversion of the state purpose.

It is interesting to note the unanimity with which this entire group of writers proclaims the end both of the principle of state sovereignty and of the concrete state in its present form. While Angell prefers to extend his outlook no further than the Labor Party manifesto and the standard demands of civil liberty, all the others look forward to a collectivist commonwealth of federal type, embodying generally the recommendations of British guild socialism and harmonizing with the demands of political socialism as we know it in the United States.

De Maetzu vs. Laski

Yet underneath these important agreements there runs a difference in philosophical viewpoint which may soon bring important cleavage. This difference lies in the conception of the purpose of the state, to carry it a step further, of the ultimate good of life. By De Maetzu and Laski alone is this distinction clearly defined. To the latter the ultimate good is human personality. The purpose of the state is the perfection and happiness of the personalities composing it. The final sanction of the state is therefore the individual conscience, and the greatest contribution the individual can make to the state is allegiance to this sanction, even at the cost of conscientious objection and resistance.

To De Maetzu, on the other hand, the ultimate is function, the production of objective good, vaguely defined by him as moral satisfaction, scientific discovery, artistic creation, etc. The purpose of the state is therefore

[6]Irwin St. John Tucker, *Internationalism.* (Chicago; Tucker.)

[7]Ramiro de Maetzu, *Authority, Liberty and Function.* (New York: Macmillan.)

[8]Harold J. Laski, *Authority in Modern State.* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.) Also see Laski, *Problems of Sovereignty.*

[9]Laski, *Authority,* etc., p. 120.

functional efficiency, and the only rights of the individual are his rights as a functionary. Conscientious objection, to him, is merely an unethical refusal to function, and pacifism and liberalism alike are anathema as a coddling of personality at the expense of objective good. Hence comes De Maetzu's advocacy of guild socialism as the ideal functional organization, and of compulsion as the necessary subordination of the individual to objective production.

There seems, then, to be a real contradiction between function and personality as the ultimate good, leading logically, on the one hand, to compulsion and, on the other, to conscientious objection. It is evident also that the former is in line with guildism as set forth by G. D. H. Cole,[10] and the latter with traditional British liberalism and, still more significantly, with the newer ideals of Christianity. It is not by chance that De Maetzu condemns individualism and Christianity alike and that Laski, as does Belloc in an entirely different thesis,[11] makes religion the ally of individual liberty.

While the distinction between the two principles of personality and function appears definitely only in De Maetzu, this distinction must eventually be considered by the advocates of guild socialism. Are the rights of the individual only those which accrue to him as a functionary, a producer of coal or poems or passing fashions? If so, De Maetzu is right and the functional is the only just organization of the state. In that case, however, those under and over working age, the invalided, and all those whose functions may not be recognized as valuable by the existing state, must constitute a powerless section of society, whose franchise and other rights are theirs only by courtesy of the active guilds.

In practice, to be sure, consumption is recognized as a function, and guildsmen, even De Maetzu, expect a dual sovereignty—the consumers, on the one hand, organized as the political state, and, on the other, the producers in the guilds. The practical question then becomes—is personality as embodied in the political state to constitute the sovereign power, with veto right over the producers' house, or are both to stand as coördinate? In the latter arrangement, advocated by Cole and De Maetzu and uncontradicted by such guildsmen as Roberts, we are confronted by a system of state inequality, only the active (and perhaps also the retired) producers of recognized goods to be given full political rights by a vote in both houses. There would remain in half disfranchisement not only incapacitated persons and a large number of women, whose housekeeping function admits of but slight organization,[12] but the still more important class of free lances, adventurers, and producers of physical or spiritual goods unrecognized by the guilds of their day. De Maetzu's logic seems thus inevitable, that functional organization, if untempered by the sovereignty of the consumer, leads to the dethronement of personality and the justification of compulsion by the active majority.

Efficiency vs. Liberty

The ideal of functional organization is efficiency, the production of objective good, but, as "the Germany heresy" seems to indicate, this ideal leads directly to the suppression of the individual by the organization, whether that organization be single or plural. The ideal of personality, however, is not efficiency but liberty, and its achievement, as feebly foreshadowed in Anglo-Saxon history, is not so much the successful production of objective goods as the progressive enlargement of the vision by which society, through the unfettered individual, may determine for itself what those objective goods may be.

State sovereignty is doomed. Socialism and the guilds must come. Yet not upon function and plural organization, but upon personality and the conscientious objector, depends human liberty.

[10] Cole. *Self Government in Industry.*

[11] Hilaire Belloc, *The Servile State.*

[12] Angell, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

The Negro in Industry[1]

Herbert J. Seligmann

The world war helped to dispel the myth that the American Negro was at best an agricultural laborer only and that complicated industrial processes overtaxed his abilities. That myth was dispelled in the factories where colored workmen did white men's work and did as well, and often better, than immigrants from Europe. In the course of the practical demonstration of their capacity as machinists and factory operatives, colored men not only established themselves in the North; their prosperity exerted a pull on their friends in the South, so that the immigration, even after the signing of the armistice, alarmed Southern communities whose labor supply was being depleted.

The immigration intensified many of the maladjustments of industrial society. Congestion and overcrowding occurred in the cities to which the colored workers came. Bitter antagonisms were brought about between white labor unions and unorganized colored workers. Many white people who had known color prejudice only in the off-hand way of contempt found their emotions feverishly active when their men and colored men competed for jobs or when, during a strike, places were filled with Negroes imported by hundreds from Alabama, Mississippi, or Georgia.

The increased tension between the races to which the northward movement contributed had two main determinants: First, recognition by northern industrialists that they must find some source of cheap labor to compensate the stoppage of immigration during the war and that Southern Negroes were available for their purposes. Second, a realization by white labor unionists that their unions were endangered by an influx of aliens, unorganized, distrustful of labor unions and therefore difficult and in many cases impossible, for the time, to unionize. What has been called "group protection" became a strong motive among white unionists. Independent as it was of racial antipathy—for hostility would have been directed against any laborers who threatened union standards—it speedily fastened on the color line. Thus from the industrial movements and readjustments incident to the war grew a new race conflict.

For the Negro wartime opportunity was especially significant in that it enabled him as never before to play with capital and with labor. In a short space of time Negroes found themselves preferred in many plants from which they had previously been excluded or where they had been employed in small numbers only. Their leaders urged them not to serve as strike-breakers; just as the more intelligent of the white union leaders had warned against dividing labor by the color line. In practice, white unionists had discriminated against the Negro, had given him no jobs when the allotments were made or had given the most arduous and disageeable work; had either discouraged his joining their unions or had made it virtually impossible for him to do so. In practice, the Negro, indoctrinated with the brotherhood of man and the common interests of all labor, irrespective of color, took advantage of the situation which presented itself. Colored workers in many instances saw no reason why, having always been made victims of white discrimination, they should fight the white unionists' battles.

Trade Unions and the Negro

The Negro's distrust of unionism, justified as it has been by discrimination in the North, is based on the treatment of colored labor in the South. It has been the rule to exclude Negroes from white unions. In June of 1919, it was reported that two thousand white unionists of Richmond, Virginia, had withdrawn from the Virginia Federation of Labor because W. C. Page, a Negro of Newport News, had been seated as a delegate. Under the circumstances, the American Federation of Labor, at its spring meeting of 1919, indulged

[1]Portion of a chapter in a forthcoming book on *The Negro Question* by Mr. Seligmann.

in a more or less empty gesture in voting with but one dissenting voice to admit Negroes to full membership. As is well known, the Federation exercises no power over its constituent international unions. At the same convention at which the vote was taken, a representative of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks justified the exclusion of Negroes from his union and announced that the color line would be drawn in the future as it had in the past. One of the colored delegates to the convention reported that in Virginia, from March to April, 1919, 43,000 Negro workmen had been obliged to join an independent labor union because they could not be received into those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

The influence of Southern delegates to the Federation had always prevented effective measures to organize Negroes. Even where the constitution of the union contained no express prohibition, it was not uncommon for white membership to double while no Negroes were added, in an industry giving employment to both white and colored men. It is recounted in Epstein's *The Negro Migrant in Pittsburgh* that one labor leader reported a growth in membership of one hundred per cent. in six months, in the Pittsburgh district. He said that there were no colored men in the union, although numbers had applied for membership and complaints had been made of discrimination.

"His statement concerning efforts to organize Negro laborers," the investigator comments, "would seem to have little meaning in view of his assertion that the growth of white membership during the past year was one hundred per cent., while that of Negro membership was zero." This man's attitude is found typical of the "complacent trade unionist."

At the very time when it was claimed that the union was endeavoring to organize Negro workers, a white man who joined was reported to have been pledged as follows by the president of the union: "I pledge that I will not introduce for membership into this union anyone but a sober, industrious *white* person." Among labor leaders, too, are men born in the South, convinced that the Negro is inferior and strongly adherent to the advantages of segregation and "Jim-crowing." Through the influence of individual labor leaders and of delegates to the Federation, the Southern practice was made fairly general in the North, while Negroes were not in a position to constitute a menace to unionism.

With the demand for Negro labor to supply war-time and after-war needs, the scene changed. The Federation made its gesture of generosity. Unions whose strikers were being replaced suddenly discovered the brotherhood of man. The Negro found himself in a position of strategic importance.

Obstacles to Progress

Every sort of opposition was offered the Negro during his progress to industrial bargaining power. Mr. Roger Baldwin, who worked as a manual laborer in the Middle West during October and November of 1919, writes:

"Everywhere, of course, the Negroes had the hardest and most disagreeable jobs. Only the exceptional Negro had risen above the lowest paid day laborer rate. That's the rate I was getting too! And it was these men I found really thinking, keenly conscious of the relation of their own problem to the race and to labor. Every one of the men was in favor of the unions, but every one of them complained of union discrimination against the Negro. They are ready for organization which they felt would be fair to them.

"On the other hand, there was a feeling of desperation because of the almost universal ignoring or contempt of the Negro. Every man I spoke to talked of warfare between the races. All of them were preparing to resist further invasion of what they regarded as their rights. They didn't seem to have faith that white men, even in the unions, were going to make common cause with them. Even the scabs in the steel mill at Homestead, Pennsylvania, where Negroes have been imported by the thousand, were all for the union and all for a strike at the right time, but they felt that they owed nothing to white men who had so long ignored and oppressed them. Not a single organizer had been sent into the Pittsburgh steel district. . . . I couldn't help but feel as I looked around at the forces lined up about me that the immediate future of American labor depends on what the unions will do with the Negro. It is

the white man's job if he is to make the solidarity of labor a living fact."

Mr. Baldwin found no "theoretical radicalism" among the Negroes. "I found," he says, "no trace of 'red' propaganda, but I found observations and conclusions expressed in as 'red' terms as I have ever heard them from a soap-box agitator. It is obvious that the conditions themselves produce radical thinking."

The Negro and the Steel Strike

Discrimination against Negro labor bore fruit in the steel strike of 1919. The conditions which materially helped to produce the East St. Louis riots and the Chicago disorders were reproduced. Despite opposition in the South, where labor recruiters and agents risked death at the hands of a mob if their errand were made known, Negroes were brought North. Negro welfare workers were employed at the Homestead and Duquesne plants of the Carnegie Steel Company, at the Monessen plant of the Pittsburgh Steel Company; and by the Lockhart Iron and Steel Company. Three of the four basic mills of the United States Steel Corporation and the largest of the independent mills pursued the policy of encouraging employment of Negroes. During the first six weeks of the steel strike 6,000 Negroes, it was estimated, were brought to Allegheny County.

At Lackawanna, before the strike there were said to be 7,000 employes of whom 72 were Negroes. During the strike the mill was operated chiefly with Negro labor. Some of the steel mills employed Negro preachers. Early in November a representative of the Urban League said that Negroes in the steel works had remained at work during the strike almost to a man. There were, of course, exceptions, but in general, however favorably they were disposed to white labor unions, Negroes became effective instruments to be used against white unions.

A New Southern Alignment

If the vote of the American Federation of Labor to unionize Negroes was an anticipation and a recognition of the menace of division of labor along color lines, that state of mind found recognition in the South. For the first time to any marked extent white labor realized the necessity of making allies of colored workers. Any such general change of front by white workmen would menace the very foundations of the color line as it is drawn in the South. It is, therefore, significant to note what extraordinary measures were adopted to prevent a coalition of white and colored labor. As always, the advocates of the color line brought about violence to sustain the division. It is, therefore, a melodramatic episode which reveals the forces which were at work in the South.

In Bogalusa, Louisiana, on November 22, 1919, three white men were shot dead, and a number severely wounded. One of the men killed was district president of the American Federation of Labor; another was a union carpenter. The white men were killed because they had walked armed down the main street of Bogalusa protecting with their lives and guns the life of a colored labor organizer.

"The black man," says Miss Mary White Ovington, "had dared to organize in a district where organization meant at the least exile, at the most death by lynching." In the town where his white protectors were shot dead for refusing to give him up, the controlling lumber company had in the fall of 1919 ordered 2,500 union men to destroy their union cards. "The company," said Miss Ovington, "has at its command the Loyalty League, a state organization formed during the war, not of soldiers, but of men at home, part of whose business it was to see that every able-bodied man (Negro understood) should work at any task, at any wage, and for any hours that the employer might desire. They had back of them the state 'work or fight' law and might put to work men temporarily unemployed, save that the provision of the Act did not apply to 'persons temporarily unemployed by reason of differences with their employers such as strikes or lockouts.' Under this legislation it was small wonder that unionism was forbidden by the

Lumber Company; or that, unionism continuing, despite the master's mandate, the Loyalty League, though the war was ended, continued its work." It was in the continuance of this "work" that the Negro organizer was hunted and the three white union men who protected him were shot down.[2]

As early as June, 1919, the president of the New Orleans branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had reported the expulsion from Bogalusa of respectable colored men "among them a doctor owning about $50,000 worth of property," because they had refused to advise colored people against joining the unions. The Committee which visited the colored citizens gave them twenty minutes, or an hour, or six hours to leave town, according to their circumstances.

Whatever the outcome of the investigation or neglect of this situation, one fact of major significance for race relations was uncovered there. As Miss Ovington said in comment: "Not since the days of Populism has the South seen so dramatic an espousal by the white man of the black man's cause."

It indicated the beginning of the end of the exploitation of both white and colored workers by pitting their groups against one another and by fanning the animosities that left them hostile. White men, too poor to pay a poll tax, ignorant and disfranchised, have found a key to such industrial conditions as those in Bogalusa. When they join forces with colored labor, a political as well as an industrial system that is founded in misinformation, oppression, artificially-fostered hatreds and brutalities begins to totter.

As the color line is stretched and becomes a matter of national concern, it becomes more and more evident that colored labor cannot be treated as though it were a monstrosity or a rare specimen. Too much evidence is at hand which demonstrates that not only have colored men done their work as well as white, often increasing output in factories manned previously by white men; but also have worked in amity, without friction, among white workers. The elaborate plans made by the steel companies to obtain and to keep Negro labor tell their own story. The Urban League of Pittsburgh found that the Negro laborer "can do anything the white worker can do." If some Negroes are unsteady, on the other hand, there are "hundreds and hundreds and even thousands of Negroes who have not lost a single day and are counted upon by concerns as their most dependable men."

Conclusions

It is not necessary to draw from the evidence presented any conclusions other than those written upon the face of the facts: namely, that the Negro has enormously enlarged his sphere of opportunity in industry by doing satisfactorily the work allotted to him; that he has worked with white men amicably; and that the future of the American labor movement will be involved to some extent in the position which the Negro workman is given or takes. In the existing state of industrial organization, the Negro's capabilities as they may be limited or determined by racial inheritance, play a small part. With few exceptions industries are not so thoroughly organized that slight individual and psychological differences make themselves felt in large-scale production. Meanwhile the test of practice has been applied. The results have shown industrial corporations eager to employ and to retain Negro labor. That is a fact which, regardless of racial prejudice, actual or alleged racial "inferiority," it is necessary for any student of labor currents to take into account.

Not only the Negro's position in industry but the orderliness with which new forms of society are devised, depends upon the Negro's sense of his real share in the building of American civilization. He may be made a valuable source of power and inventiveness, or he may be driven to the self-defense which means destruction of the society which provokes it.

[2] See also the account of the affair in the New York *Times* of November 23, 1919; New York *Globe,* November 24, 1919; also Ovington in *Liberator,* January, 1920.

*Guild Socialism**

Harry W. Laidler

No phase of socialism has of late done more to capture the imagination of the young intellectual in England and America than has the theory popularly described as guild socialism.

This theory may be said to date back to 1907, the year that A. J. Penty, in *The Restoration of the Guild System,* first endeavored to apply the modern social problems something of the spirit of the mediæval guild,[1] a cardinal principle of which was that "direct management and control should be in the hands *of the producers* under a system of regulation in the common interest." [Italics mine.] The idea was soon developed into a constructive theory of the national guilds, first by A. R. Orage and S. G. Hobson,[2] and later by G. D. H. Cole and other writers and speakers of the National Guilds League (formed in 1915).[3]

Composition of Movement

This theory arose in part as a reaction against the bureaucratic collectivism advocated by many groups in English life,[4] and, in part, as a protest against the inadequacies of syndicalism, and an endeavor to find a happy medium between bureaucratic collectivist and the syndicalist philosophy. It also contains numerous other currents of thought. As Reckitt and Bechhofer have expressed it:

"We should find the craftsmen's challenge and the blazing democracy of William Morris; the warning of Mr. Belloc against the huge shadow of the servile state and, perhaps, something also of his claim for the individual's control over property; the insistence of Mr. Penty on the evils of industrialism and its large scale organization, and his recovery and bequest to us of the significant and unique word 'guild.' We should find something of French syndicalism, with its championship of the producer; something of American industrial unionism, with its clear vision of the need for industrial organization; and something of Marxian socialism with its unsparing analysis of the wage system by which capitalism exalts itself and enslaves the mass of men."[5]

The Wage System

Negatively, national guildsmen, as they prefer to call themselves, contend, together with the majority of organized socialists throughout the world, that the main drive against capitalism should not be a drive against poverty, but one for the abolition of the wage system. Positively they maintain that the chief aim of the new social order should be the development of personality, not mere industrial efficiency, and that the worker should be assured, at least, the following things:

"1. Recognition and payment as a human being, and not merely as the mortal tenement of so much labor power for which any efficient demand exists.

"2. Consequently, payment in employment and in unemployment, in sickness and in health alike.

"3. Control of the organization of production in coöperation with his fellows.

"4. A claim upon the product of his work, also exercised in coöperation with his fellows."[6]

National guildsmen also emphasize, as has been stated, something of the ideal of William Morris and other socialists, the development of joy in labor, the bringing of beauty and art into the common work of the world.

---

*Part of a chapter on this subject in "Socialism in Thought and Action," by Harry W. Laidler, shortly to be published by the Macmillan Company.

[1]Renard, *Guilds in the Middle Ages,* p. xii.

[2]Orage, *National Guilds* (1913).

[3]The most important contribution on the subject has of late been made by Mr. Cole, in his book, *Self Government in Industry* (1918). Other literature on the subject is Reckitt and Bechhofer, *The Meaning of National Guilds* (1919); Hobson, *Guild Principle in War and Peace* (1918); Penty, *Old Worlds for New* (1917); Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom,* and articles in *The New Age,* and the literauture of the National Guilds League, 39 Cursitor Street, Chancery Lane, London, W. C., Eng.

[4]The guildsmen have been wont to hurl their shafts of ridicule against the alleged bureaucratic collectivism advocated by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and other members of the Fabian Society. While their criticisms undoubtedly contained some truth, many of the attacks have been decidedly unfair.

[5]Reckitt and Bechhofer, *op. cit.,* pp. xiii-xiv.

Only through giving the worker an opportunity for self-expression can this ideal be attained. Says Cole again:

"Freedom for self-expression, freedom at work as well as at leisure, freedom to serve as well as to enjoy—that is the guiding principle of his [Morris'] life. That, too, is the guiding principle of national guilds. We can only destroy the tyranny of machinery—which is not the same as destroying machinery itself—by giving into the hands of the workers the control of their life and work, by freeing them to choose whether they will make well or ill, whether they will do the work of slaves or of free men." [7]

State Ownership and Guild Management

Underlying much of their concrete proposals are the principles of organization by function and dual sovereignty. Their criticisms of the present system and their ideal of the good life of the future have led guildsmen specifically to advocate the ownership of industry by the state, but the management of industry by democratic groups of hand and brain workers—including all of the producers in industry—organized into local, sectional and national guilds.

The guildsmen believe that, in a democratic society, the consumers should organize in a geographical association, the state, for the purpose of executing those purposes which affect all citizen-consumers equally and in the same way—such, for instance, as the maintenance of parks, roads, houses, water and other public utilities, education, health, the relations with other states, etc. On the other hand, producers should organize in a group that represents them and which is best fitted to give expression to the economic relationship between man and man.

It is impossible, the guildsman declares, to picture the exact workings of the guild under the ideal order. Mr. Cole, however, suggests possible lines of development. He sees the national guild, the supreme council of the producers, composed of a number of works, corresponding roughly to the corporation of to-day, and each works containing a number of shops. The workers in each shop, he believes, should elect a shop committee to act as a counterpoise, where one is needed, to the authority of the foreman, and to serve as an intelligence bureau and executive of the shop. A works committee also should be chosen, consisting of representatives from each shop, elected, perhaps, by direct ballot. There should likewise be a district committee to coördinate production in the various works, and to arrange for the supplying of commodities to the municipalities and other guilds. Representatives should be elected to this district committee from each works and from each craft in the district. Finally should come the national guild, made up of representatives from each district and from each craft. Each worker should have the privilege of casting two votes, one from his district and one from his craft. In addition to the national executive, there should be a national delegates' meeting, made up of representatives from each district, and from each craft in that district, which would, to all intents, serve as a final court of appeal.

Selection of Officers

Guildsmen should elect not only committees of management, but also officers. Foremen should be elected directly by the workers in the shops, and heads of clerical departments, by the ballots of all the members of their respective departments. The works manager, who deals with production, should be elected by the workers in the manipulative side of the works; the manager of the clerical department, by the clerical workers; the general manager, by the works committee. Experts should be chosen by the various committees, subject to qualifying examinations. Such examinations should, in fact, play an important rôle in all elections. Tenure of office for lower officials might be for one year; for higher officials, for a longer period; for experts, at the pleasure of the committee. Sovereignty should reside in the representative body, or, in the last analysis, in the whole mass of members.

In production, the local units should be self-governing. The organization of ex-

[6] Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 155.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-2.

change, however, should be carried on by a national authority in coöperation with the local authorities. The various works would supply their products to the district committees, which committees would pay the works according to price lists prepared by the national guilds, quality as well as quantity being considered, and would take charge of the task of distribution.

The consumer should be properly safeguarded against extortionate prices. This could be accomplished, if the state were given the power to collect a rent from each guild for government expenses, the rent being apportioned according to ability to pay. If a guild asked a monopoly price, it would thus be charged a higher rent, and "the state would thus receive in revenue what the consumer paid in enhanced prices." As price fixing is a social function, it would probably be left to a joint congress equally representative of the state or the consumers and the guilds, or the producers. The state should also have a say in the determination of the amount of commodities to be produced.

Contribution of Guildsmen

The guildsmen's opposition to the wage system and to bureaucratic collectivism, their acceptance of the principle of ownership of industry by a democratic community, their insistence on personality as the goal of social effort, their demand for democratic management, and their belief that the consumers should share in the fixing of prices and the amount of the product are all in line with the teachings of the organized socialist movement here and abroad.

Their insistence on organization by function and on the necessity of thinking through the details of democratic control are new and welcome notes in the socialist and labor movement.

Socialists and Guildsmen

A number of socialists, together with some of the guildsmen, are not convinced of the correctness of the doctrine of dual sovereignty emphasized by Cole. With Philip Snowden, some socialists fear that the guildsmen "exalt too highly the importance of mere production by placing it in a position coequal if not superior to the social organization for the satisfaction of the individual's every need." They contend that "production is not an end in itself. It is merely a means to the satisfaction of man's varied requirements and needs which go to make up the fully developed life in a civilized community." They fear to see even under socialism "the minds and efforts of *all* workmen too much devoted to the organization of production," on the ground that it would lessen the workers' interest in and their leisure for matters of far greater importance. For "it is as a consumer in the widest sense of the word," they claim, that the worker "will realize his individuality and enjoy his freedom."[8]

Some socialists are as yet unconvinced that the guild organization as worked out is absolutely necessary for securing the freedom which will satisfy the legitimate claims of workers, and some prefer joint boards of management, consisting of representatives both of the community and of the workmen, to exclusive control by the workers. Others, including John A. Hobson, declare that the political and industrial systems are bound in the future to be far more interwoven than at present, and that it is impossible to separate them in the manner proposed by guild socialists.[9] Other criticisms have to do not with the guildsmen's proposals, but with their pessimism concerning the efficacy of political action. On the other hand, in the left wing of the socialist movement may be found those who complain that the guildsmen have not relegated the state to a sufficiently obscure position.

The criticisms, however, are far more in difference of emphasis than in difference of principle, and the vast majority of the organized socialists are grateful to this movement for its vital and important contributions.

[8] Philip Snowden, in "State Socialism and the National Guilds," *The Socialist Review* (British), April-June, 1919.

[9] Hobson, *Democracy After the War*, pp. 181-2.

Suspension of the Assemblymen

A Symposium

No attempt at suppression of minority opinion during the whole tragic year since the signing of the armistice caused such universal condemnation from liberal-minded men and women here and abroad as did the action of the New York Assembly on January 7, 1920, in suspending the five duly elected socialist assemblymen from that body.[1]

In November, 1919, against the fusion of Republicans and Democrats, five socialists were elected to the New York Assembly from Greater New York. Assemblymen August Claessens and Charles Solomon served last year, Samuel Orr and Louis Waldman, in 1918, while Samuel A. De Witt was elected in November for the first time.

Of the work of these assemblymen, the eminently respectable Citizens' Union, a nonpartisan organization of years' standing, had the following:

Augustus Claessens: "An adroit and clever exponent of socialistic point of view. Emphatic but seldom effective in debate. His record of votes on city measures continued excellent." (1919 Report.)

Charles Solomon: "Able in debate, with excellent record of votes on city measures." (1919 Report.)

Louis Waldman: "Presented some of the most radical proposals of the session. A tireless, but not always tiresome debater. Excellent voting record on city bills." (1918 Report.)

Samuel Orr: "While two of his bills were fundamentally unsound, paid close attention and made excellent voting record." (1918 Report.)

At the opening of the legislature, the socialists, as was their wont, journeyed to Albany prepared to take an active part in every legislative measure affecting the interests of the workers.

They were prepared particularly to fight the continuance of the Lusk Committee, and had been collecting a mass of evidence of a startling character against the methods of that body. They were pledged to fight for labor legislation, and in so doing were ready for innumerable bouts with Speaker Thaddeus C. Sweet, a wealthy manufacturer, who, according to Rose Schneidermann, president of the Women's Trade Union League, "was responsible for the death last year of the Eight-Hour Day, Minimum Wage, Compulsory Health and other bills," and under whose régime as speaker few if any labor bills were permitted to pass.

The Suspension

The Assembly convened. The majority of representatives were, as usual, out in the lobby. Speaker Sweet stepped on the dais, summoned the socialists before him, and, without a moment of warning, bitterly denounced the five for their socialist principles. Without permitting them to reply, he turned to the clerk and asked that the latter read the resolution passed to him amid a torrent of other bills by Majority Leader Simon L. Adler.[2]

The resolution was read. It accused the socialists of being members of the Socialist Party; referred to the St. Louis resolution of the party; claimed that the party had "declared its adherence and solidarity with the revolutionary government of Soviet Russia and pledged itself and its members to furtherance of the International Socialist

[1] It may be of special interest to note that all of the five socialist assemblymen were engaged in a vigorous fight against the left-wing elements in the Socialist Party during the spring of 1919, and, at the party convention in September, Charles Solomon, Louis Waldman, August Claessens and Samuel Orr were regarded as among the right-wing delegates of the New York delegation, and were in the forefront of the fight against the extremists. Orr is a lawyer, De Witt a manufacturer of machinery and a writer of verse, Claessens a party lecturer, Waldman a bachelor of science from Cooper Institute and civil engineer, and latterly connected with the United Labor Education Committee, Solomon a journalist and law student.

[2] Adler is a Rochester clothing merchant recently engaged in a bitter fight with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and openly opposed by a number of the socialist assemblymen.

Revolution"; also that "in such adherence and declaration the party endorsed the principles of the Communist International now being held in Moscow, which International is pledged to the forcible and violent overthrow of all organized governments now existing."

The resolution added:

"That the state constitution of the Socialist Party provides that a member of the party may be expelled or suspended from the party, if, after election to public office, such member refuses to abide by and carry out instructions he may receive from the 'dues-paying party organization', and that such instructions may be given by an executive committee made up in whole or in part of aliens or enemy aliens."

The resolution was declared privileged and consequently undebatable. Not a single word of proof of the charges was offered, not a single word of defense was allowed. The roll was called and the members who knew nothing of the intended action were compelled to vote for or against the suspension on the basis of unproven charges. Four socialists and two Democrats voted against the resolution, 140 for it. One socialist refused to vote.

The speaker thereupon called in the Sergeant-at-arms, and the socialists were peremptorily ordered out of the room. Speaker Sweet then declared that the members were suspended, pending the action of the Judiciary Committee.

Following the suspension, Attorney General Newton of the State declared that the action against the socialists had nothing to do with their personal qualifications, but was due to their membership in the Socialist Party; that the Socialist Party was "not a party in the real sense of that term," because it admitted aliens and minors to its membership, and that all factions of the party might be classed as enemies of the government.[1]

The Socialists' Defence

The five Assemblymen immediately issued a statement, in which they declared that the procedure "was violative of the fundamental law of the land," declared their belief in political action, asserted that it was not at all improbable that the members of the Assembly were seeking "to discourage the people with the methods afforded by representative government and to provoke them to resort to the methods of violence," and promised "to do all in their power to expose this conspiracy and defeat its purpose."

"We believe," they declared, "in the accepted methods of the Socialist Party—agitation, education, and organization on the political and industrial field, and the organization of the workers particularly for the expression of social dissatisfaction through their unions and the ballot box. We shall continue to counsel a transformation of society in the direction of industrial democracy, which can be accomplished only when the workers own those things their lives depend upon, and we shall urge our auditors and adherents to act in an orderly and legal manner."

The Assemblymen allege that their suspension was largely due to the influence of the Lusk Committee, and that they were prepared to urge an investigation of the activities of the Committee. They made public ten questions asking the relation between this Committee and R. N. Nathan, Chief of the British Secret Service in this country.[2]

Denial of Charges

The statements of the Assemblymen were followed by a declaration from the State Ex-

[1] He said in part: "So far as I know the Assembly did not base its action on any evidence reflecting upon the five socialists individually. There is nothing personal in the proceedings. They are brought against these five because they are members of the Socialist Party and as such must and doubtless do subscribe to theories and principles which are subversive to an orderly form of government and a menace to our democratic institutions."

[2] "Is it true," read the ninth question, "that, shortly after the aforesaid incidents [the raiding of the Soviet Bureau and the Rand School], Mr. Nathan, in full possession of the original papers and photostats [obtained during the raid of the Soviet Bureau or afterwards duplicated] left the United States for England?

"Is it true that the original papers obtained by Mr. Nathan were of great commercial importance to the United States and that his possession of them enabled his government to obtain commercial and diplomatic advantages in its relations with the Soviet Government of Russia?" To these questions a blank denial was given, which the socialists claimed constituted an insufficient answer.

ecutive Committee, in which the charges contained in the Adler resolution, characterized as "vicious misstatements," were taken up one by one. The Committee added:

"Support Soviet Russian Government." The Socialist Party is not committed to any international organization, *and even if affiliated with the Moscow International, this would not commit it to violence.* The International, in its official statements, leaves to its affiliated national groups questions of policy and methods, *stating distinctly that political action is perfectly consistent with such affiliation. As recently as last August our party emphatically reaffirmed its policy of education, organization, and peaceful appeal to the suffrage of the voters."* [Italics ours.]

"Exaction of Membership Pledge." "In requiring this pledge of members [to be guided by the Constitution and platform of the party] a pledge that has been a qualification for membership for twenty years, we have intended to guard against political trading and compromise with other political parties. To sign such a pledge is no more a violation of the Constitution of the United States than similar pledges taken by members of the Masonic order, Knights of Columbus, trade unions, or any other associations of citizens."

"Alien Control of Party." "We deny that instructions are given elected officials by 'the Executive Committee made up in whole or in part by aliens or alien enemies'. The overwhelming majority of the party membership is made up of citizens. Its officers and members of political committees are always citizens. The party has maintained bureaus and special committees to aid noncitizens to become citizens and it has often been obstructed in this civic work by Republican and Democratic politicians who are vociferous in their Americanism.

"No official or member of the party has ever received instructions in violation of State or Federal Constitutions, or in violation of any laws of the state or Nation."

While the party opposed the war, it did not favor violence and open rebellion, but conducted its work along legal lines. Nor did it urge the people "to refuse to engage even in the production of munitions of war and other necessities."

"Even in the Duma of the old Russian Czar," it stated in conclusion, "socialists held seats in the days of blackest reaction. . . .

"We call the attention of our political opponents to the statement of the great American, Abraham Lincoln, in the first inaugural address that 'If, by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly rendered constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would if such a right were a vital one.' . . .

"We have faced fusion of our enemies. Elections have been stolen from us by thugs in the service of our opponents. Now, after triumphing in a number of districts over all these obstacles, we face the autocratic ukase of a desperate and anti-democratic opposition which denies us the representation we and our constituents have won by hard and bitter struggle. Many thousands of voters are brutally disfranchised by this unseating of our representatives."

Non-Socialist Protests

The socialists, however, were not the only ones, nor were they the principal ones to protest. The *New York World* characterized the action of the Assembly as "The most revolutionary blow ever dealt to representative government in the United States," adding, "if the action of the New York Assembly can stand as a precedent, representative government has ceased to exist in this State, because all rights of the minority have been destroyed. . . . It is a doctrine of despotism."

"Did any anarchist, did any nihilist," it asks in another issue, "ever make so plausible an argument for the use of the bomb and the torch in redressing the balance of government as the Sweets and Lusks and the Newtons have made in this proceeding?"

The *N. Y. Evening Post* asserted that the action was an "invitation to a national witch hunt," "a sinister threat against the fundamentals of democracy and representative government." The suspension, according to *The Journal,* was "the most serious assault upon the liberties of the American people that has been made since a British King and Parliament forced our fathers to protect their freedom with arms in hand. Not all the anarchists in the country multiplied by ten could strike such a deadly blow at law and order. It is a treasonable defiance of the Constitution and flat rebellion against the written laws and the inherent sovereignty of the people."

Hosts of citizens lent their voices in protest, including Governor Alfred Smith, Ex-Gov-

ernor Martin J. Glynn, Ex-Governor Charles S. Whitman, Mayor Hylan, President F. H. La Guardia of the New York Board of Aldermen, Samuel Untermeyer, Thomas Chadbourne, while, on January 10, Charles Evans Hughes took up the cudgels for representative government with a merciless attack against the action of the legislature, in part, as follows:

"It is not, as I view it, in accordance with the spirit of our institutions, but, on the contrary, it is absolutely opposed to the fundamental principles of our government for a majority to undertake to deny representation to a minority through its representatives elected by ballots lawfully cast.

"If there was anything against these men as individuals, if they were deemed to be guilty of criminal offenses, they should have been charged accordingly. But I understand that the action is not directed against these five elected members as individuals, but that the proceeding is virtually an attempt to indict a political party and to deny it representation in the legislature. That is not, in my judgment, American government. . . .

"Are socialists, unconvicted of crime, to be denied the ballot? If socialists are permitted to vote, are they not permitted to vote for their own candidates? If their candidates are elected and are men against whom, as individuals, charges of disqualifying offenses cannot be laid, are they not entitled to their seats?

"What, may I add, is it supposed these socialists will do in the legislature? As members they may introduce bills, they may oppose bills, they may debate them. In all matters they are subject to the rules of the Assembly. Why should these privileges be denied to representatives of the Socialist Party? Is it not clear that the government cannot be saved at the cost of its own principles?

"If the socialists were denied recourse through their duly elected representatives to the orderly process of government, what resort is there left to them? *Is it proposed to drive the socialists to revolution by denying them participation in the means we have provided for orderly discussion of proposed changes in our laws?* [Italics ours.]

"Nothing, in my judgment, is a more serious mistake at this critical time than to deprive socialists or radicals of their opportunities for peaceful discussion and thus to convince them that the Reds are right and that violence and revolution are the only available means at their command.

"Instead of protecting us from revolution, it will do more to encourage the spirit of revolution and to strengthen the advocates of violence than any conceivable propaganda could accomplish."

These pronouncements were followed by resolutions on the part of numerous organizations protesting against the Assembly's action, including the Women's City Club, The Young Republican Club, The New York City Club, The Committee of Forty-Eight, The Central Federated Union of New York, scores of labor unions, and even the National Security League!

Representatives from numerous labor and civic bodies met in the Rand School and raised many thousands of dollars for the purpose of fighting the case, passing a resolution that an investigation be started into the forces back of this attack. The New York Bar Association, by a vote of 174 to 117, on January 13, appointed a committee consisting of Charles E. Hughes, Morgan J. O'Brien, Louis Marshall, Joseph M. Proshauer, and Ogden L. Mills to go to Albany and begin a legal battle for the five suspended Assemblymen. Their resolution declared that association "unalterably opposed to any action by the Assembly excluding from its membership because of affiliation with any political party, when seeking by constitutional and legal methods to bring about any change in our constitution and laws, any person duly elected to its membership."

The socialists appointed Morris Hillquit as their leader in the legal fight. Impressed with the widespread public indignation, many of the Democrats in the Assembly deserted Speaker Sweet's cause and thirty-three members, including a few Republicans, voted to reconsider the resolution suspending the socialists. Seventy-one remained with the Republican machine and voted against reconsideration. Tuesday, January 20, was the date decided on for the hearings before the Judiciary Committee.

A Symposium

The Socialist Review, desirous of presenting to its readers the real meaning of the Assembly's action from the lips of social thinkers, both non-socialists and socialists, asked a selected list of men and women for an expression of opinion on this vital question. The replies received were in part as follows:

Gifford Pinchot

To disqualify any duly elected member of a legislative body because of political or economic beliefs is contrary to American tradition and destructive of the foundations of representative government upon which our liberty is founded.

Don Seitz
(of the *New York World*)

It would seem that the action of the New York Assembly in excluding the duly elected members sent there by the Socialist Party was a disconcerting manifestation of the lack of confidence in the very American institution they seem so eager to defend.

Henry R. Seager
(of Columbia University)

The reason why the action of the New York Assembly has roused thoughtful citizens as have few recent occurrences is that it is so clearly a blow at our fundamental American institutions. If I were a socialist I might find solace in the certain tendency of such arbitrary conduct to drive liberally-minded citizens into the Socialist Party. As a non-socialist, I can see in it only a denial of the essential American right of representation through duly chosen representatives, which, if persisted in, must prove fatal to our free American system of government. It gives the lie to the assertion that I am constantly making in condemnation of I. W. W. and Bolshevik agitation that under our constitution every adult citizen enjoys the right to support his convictions through the ballot and to have a representative at the seat of government so soon as he can persuade a sufficient number of his fellow citizens to view questions of the day as he views them, and that therefore there is no excuse nor place in this country for that type of radicalism which advocates the forcible overthrow of government.

The widespread protest from conservative men and women against this action gives promise that these representatives may still be admitted to their seats. If that proves to be the case the incident may serve as a useful reminder that argument and education, not disfranchisement and suppression, are the tried and true American methods of making headway against proposals that are considered detrimental to the public interest.

William Hard

The exiling of those five socialists from the New York legislature was of course the most cowardly as well as outwardly the boldest effort so far made by rulers in the United States to substitute force for reason in our politics. The gentlemen who did the exiling will never really adventure themselves among you socialists to try to convert you from your ways by personal effort of argument at the cost of their own time and money. They propose to spare themselves this trouble, for which they have rendered themselves mentally incapable by a long course of deliberate ignorance of socialism and of every other philosophy. They are strong only in brute force and in the passions of a multitude brutalized by an ignorance disseminated in the forum and under the appearance of information through newspapers and magazines. Nevertheless, they are indeed strong. I venture to suggest that possibly the day may be at hand when believers in free institutions and in the freedom of the electorate—and they are really after all very numerous in this country—may have to give up their various divisions among themselves and, even if in economics they are Marxians, may have to unite in one political force to restore antique Americanism to the America of these revolutionary destructive innovators.

Felix Frankfurter
(Harvard University Law School)

Of course, the action of the New York Assembly is subversive of all that is meant by constitutional processes of democratic government and is the kind of intolerance that breeds intolerance and distrust of evolutionary development. As Governor Smith put it the other day, in his message, this sort of thing is the most sinister form of the old know-nothingism.

Dan Hoan
(Mayor of Milwaukee)

The action of the New York legislature in suspending the representatives of the Socialist Party has the earmarks of being a part of a well-planned national conspiracy of our American monied classes to crush, if possible, all forms of action on the part of the working class to better its condition. The universal newspaper campaigns, first against the war objectors, then against the I. W. W., next against the communists, and finally classing socialists, bolshevists, anarchists, and I. W. W.'s in one category reveals a carefully planned campaign of propaganda to pave the way for the program announced by a high potentate of the administration at the outset of the war, namely: "Now is the time to put the radical sons of —— out of business, and we're going to do it."

The purpose, however, here as elsewhere will fail. Progress of the human family will go on as directed by economic and natural laws. What is deemed radical today is the conservatism of tomorrow. The only observation I wish to express is that it is pitiable that all of this oppression and tyranny did not take place at least twenty years

ago so that the forces which are making the Socialist Party of America the leader of all radical and progressive thought of this nation could have matured earlier. We stand today as the only well-organized force battling for the restoration of America's Bill of Rights. Let the comrades of New York make a national fight for representative government. Let us take the lead or we shall be forced to take a secondary place in a great coalition of all those who will join a class-conscious fight for political supremacy of the working-class.

Robert M. Buck
(*The New Majority*)

No words are too strong for denunciation of the un-American madmen who deprived five socialist assemblymen of their seats in the New York legislature. Their action, like that of Congress in unseating Berger, is sedition, "an act tending to encourage treason." It indicates plainly that it is not violent revolution that the "red" raiders and their co-conspirators seek to avert, but lawful, orderly, and constitutional changes in our social and economic system. By appearing to make it impossible for changes to come by peaceful political action, these men are inciting to violent revolutions. If there are to be prosecutions for "criminal anarchy" these inciters to violence should be the ones to be prosecuted.

Norman Hapgood

I have not had time since my return to America to refresh my memory about the St. Louis platform or about the writings on which Mr. Berger was convicted. On the facts therefore I must reserve judgment. On the principles, however, my mind is clear. To the rights of the minorities there are limitations. They have not the right to foment revolution by force and at the same time to enjoy the protection of the existing government. They cannot owe a predominating allegiance to an outside organization and yet claim the right to serve in American political assemblies. These principles, however, should be used by the controlling majority with care and toleration. They should not be made an excuse for fighting any particular tendency of mind. They should be called into use only when the necessity is undoubted. There have been times when the principle of outside allegiance has been used to oppress Catholics. It should not be used now to oppress reasonable socialists. A certain number of penalties, executed on definite opponents of force, would be entirely justifiable, provided they were based on the ordinary rules of law and evidence. Sweeping disqualifications, arrests and deportations, carried on without the ordinary constitutional and legal safeguards, amount, in my opinion, to despotism. The correct principle in regard to the Albany question has been expressed by former Justice Hughes. The correct principle to apply to the general question of free speech is exactly stated by Mr. Justice Holmes, with Mr. Justice Brandeis concurring, in the case of Abrams versus the United States.

Harry F. Ward
(Union Theological Seminary)

It is interesting to see how these recent happenings reveal below the surface complex of motives the pressure of the institution of private property. The obvious danger is that the forces of reaction may destroy the power of the democratic state to afford the means for an evolutionary transition to a new order and so make unavoidable a bitter and destructive class conflict.

Horace M. Kallen
(New School of Social Research)

For a long time there had been growing tension between the labor and the "business" organizations. The labor organizations were largely identified as "radical" and "socialistic" and so on; the business classes had had no particular designation. With the coming of the war in Europe, the issue of "Americanism" and the "hyphenated" American was raised. This issue made it possible for the business class to identify with itself everything "American" and to identify the labor class with everything "foreign." Thus, under the cover of "Americanism" it has become possible for the business class to organize, consciously or unconsciously, what is nothing more or less than a conspiracy to crush the organization of labor within the country; the intransigency of Mr. Gary, the trimming of Mr. Palmer and other associated phenomena, are a part of the same economic context.

The political accompaniments like the deportations, the suspension of the socialists, and the general abrogation of constitutional rights are by-products designed to disguise and to rationalize the fundamental aggression. In one sweep of negotiation and legislation, labor has been denied all its hard-won rights—the head and front of which are collective bargaining and the right to strike.

Mr. Gompers and the American Federation of Labor are faced with the necessity of having all their work to do over again unless the excesses of the business class become a boomerang. This is on the whole not unlikely. It is not possible to predict just what will cause the throwback, nor when it will occur, but the character of the American economy is such that the prediction that it will occur is certain. It may be that the suspension of socialists is just this event.

Evans Clark
(Russian Soviet Bureau)

The surprising thing about the exclusion of the socialist assemblymen is not that they were excluded. The performance at Albany, as a matter of fact, was only a minor operation in the campaign of official violence against the awakening masses that is making the word "America," like that of Russia of old, the symbol of brutal reaction. The striking feature of the Albany affair has been the protests of those who in the past applauded or kept silent under provocations more acute.

The terrorism of Department of Justice agents, police officers, and detectives—wholesale raids, vicious assaults, violence of every conceivable kind, openly and cynically inflicted on people, most of whom were innocent even of what they were suspected and at best charged only with the holding of heretical opinions—all this lawless oppression has met with open incitation from the powerful press and silence from influential liberals and enlightened leaders of public opinion. The exile of hundreds of political offenders, and the unwilling desertion of their wives and children forced upon them by the government of the United States, drew only applause from the press and a continued silence among public men, thrown into striking perspective by the exceptional courage of Dr. Percy Stickney Grant.

The sum total of human misery and the accumulation of violations of "fundamental American ideals" implicit in these acts of terrorism have been vastly greater than in the refusal of a group of politicians at Albany to let the five socialist assemblymen take their seats. And yet in spite of the relative unimportance of the affair at Albany the influential liberals and leaders of public opinion, hitherto silent, have protested in no uncertain tones, while *The World, The Tribune, The Globe, The Mail,* and other papers have raised a perfect hue and cry about this outrage against the spirit of American institutions. The really pathetic figure in the whole affair is poor Mr. Sweet who engineered the proceedings. How could he have been expected to know that he would be a discredited Republican and not a hundred per cent. American hero?

Perhaps the liberals and the press have been "withholding their fire," as the expression among them goes, for an issue in which they could join without too much damage to their influence and the consequent loss of their power and prestige. Perhaps the Socialist Party has become respectable enough by comparison with others for the liberals and the press to defend. If this is the explanation of their protests the reign of terror has hardly begun.

On the other hand, perhaps their protests were a spontaneous outburst of pent-up indignation, goaded beyond endurance by the events of the past few months. Perhaps their very unanimity made them possible. When everyone risks his reputation—particularly on the same issue—the risks are considerably reduced. If the lid is now really off, if the inhibitions have been swept away from respectable Americans and they can now protest with impunity, then the reign of terror has passed its peak.

Allan McCurdy
(Exec. Sec. Committee of Forty-eight)

There is only one possible opinion concerning the suspending of the five socialist assemblymen from the Albany legislature. The action is an affront and insult to the soul of America. The men who are guilty of this atrocity are men who know nothing about the spirit of American institutions. They reveal the necessity for a campaign of Americanization to be held for the especial benefit of Albany legislators. They need to be told that "Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men: Therefore, the people alone have an incontestable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government; and to reform, alter or totally change the same, when their protection, safety, prosperity and happiness require it." (Article 7. Mass. Constitution. Draft of John Adams.)

Alfred Hayes
(Formerly Professor of Constitutional Law at Cornell)

Property possesses great power over public opinion. But the exercise of this power is not without limits. The blunder at Albany was haste. Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy requires the pretence of fair play. The attack on representative government in the Berger case is the same in result. Here, however, the legalistic mind is satisfied by prior legislation making criminal the expression of political opinion.

Repression has borne evil fruit. The discussion of the aims of the war was forbidden and the Versailles Treaty is the result. Teachers are dismissed because of their political views. Aliens, unable to defend themselves, suffer the heavy penalty of exile on flimsy charges. Meetings are prevented and newspapers excluded from the mails. Business and social pressure are used to terrorize. Epithet having taken the place of discussion the legislators hear only abuse. The result is unseemly rivalry to make political capital by slaying the dragon.

The ultimate effect is good. The elements of the community disfranchised are stimulated to great enthusiasm, though there is danger of discrediting political action. Public attention is centered on the issue, and the securing of attention is the essence of successful advertising. A liberal reaction is begun in large numbers of people who sincerely believe in education and prefer reason to unreason. The remote effects, particularly on youth, cannot be measured. In schools and colleges economics takes on new meaning. Perhaps in a remote hamlet or on the farm the fire is lighted in the heart of the Abraham Lincoln who shall free the industrial slaves.

Violence and starvation used abroad to prevent the success of socialism, and the disposition in the United States to do anything except the one obviously right thing of encouraging discussion on its merits are raising a presumption that truth and justice are against those who will not fight fair.

J. A. H. Hopkins
(Committee of Forty-eight)

The action of the New York legislature, in practically expelling the five members of the Socialist Party duly elected by the constituency of their districts to represent them at Albany, is apparently only another indication of the fact that the dominant groups in the Republican and Democratic parties intend to suppress all independent action and to capitalize our governmental functions for their own particular uses.

If there is any warrant in law or in fact for the action which they have taken, or if it is allowed to stand as a precedent, there will be nothing to prevent the Republican party from expelling all the Democrats, or the Democratic party expelling all the Republicans from participation in our legislative halls, according to which party held the balance of power.

Albert De Silver
(Nat. Civil Liberties Bureau)

The exclusion of Victor L. Berger from Congress, and the exclusion of the five socialist Assemblymen elected from New York City to the State Assembly present a challenge to American parliamentary government. While the exclusion of Mr. Berger has a basis in precedent, nevertheless it cannot be doubted that by excluding him Congress has chosen in effect to disfranchise a clear majority of the duly qualified electors of the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin who exercised their choice as to their representative in Congress through the forms prescribed by our fundamental law. No matter what the precedents may be, there can be no doubt that such action on the part of Congress is a clear repudiation of the principle of majority rule. The case of the socialist assemblymen excluded by the New York State Assembly is entirely without precedent. The men excluded have not been charged with or convicted of any crime or offense against our laws. They are excluded by the majority parties upon the ground that the doctrines of the minority party which elected them are inimical to the interests of the state of New York and to the interest of the United States. Such action on the part of the Assembly is, of course, a precise repudiation of representative government. It is in effect the exercise of a dictatorship by the parties in power and constitutes an abandoment of the ballot box as a method of effecting political change.

Anna Strunsky Walling

Freedom of thought and of conscience is basic and illimitable and is the cornerstone of political democracy. Freedom not only to think revolution but to urge and to make revolution was the gospel of Jeffersonian democracy and eighteenth century liberalism. The right to be in the opposition cannot be abolished at the discretion of a majority, or whenever the class in power finds it expedient. The abrogation of this right is the abrogation of the right to live, not as a revolutionist and socialist, but as a Jeffersonian democrat, as an eighteenth and nineteenth century liberal.

The spirit of the lynch-law, a shamelessness before the bar of history absolute as its own darkness, a misunderstanding of the times and a savagery in dealing with the foe which would be repellent to the primitive mind—so may one characterize the Albany atrocity. So few understand that the moral significance of a blow to representative government transcends the political. So few are sensitive to moral values. It is only when the time arrives for the people to speak that there will fall upon the ears of the world accents of truth and of justice.

James Oneal
(*New York Call*)

My article in the January *Review* under the caption of "The Case for Political Action," written before the raids on the Communist parties and the expulsion of the five socialist members of the New York State Assembly, has been verified completely by these two incidents. My contention was that deliberately to choose to abandon political action would be to play into the hands of the enemies of progress and socialism, as it would turn the hands of many against us who are sympathetic and possible converts. In addition it would give the powers of reaction good reasons for resorting to arbitrary action.

But if we retain political action and all the

forms of civilized struggle that go with it, and reaction attempts to strangle us anyway, we are placed in the strategic position of standing for the best traditions of the nation, thousands of our opponents are made sympathetic, and the reaction is placed in the public pillory. The tremendous storm of opposition and anger which the Albany bureaucrats have invited on their heads, a storm that sweeps not only the state but also the nation and even England and Europe, is a vindication of the main thesis of my article.

In fact, the stand of the party taken at Chicago, reaffirming its support of political action and the political struggle, has brought us more publicity and more sympathy than any amount of educational work could do. It has also probably brought about a situation which means a turning-point in the stark reaction that has cursed the nation for several years. What the final outcome at Albany will be no one can predict. I am inclined to think, however, that the small clique that is responsible for this blunder will be deserted by their own partisans in the Assembly and that this clique will be sacrificed by the party chiefs. But whatever the outcome, even though the clique should in some way muster sufficient forces to make the temporary exclusion of the socialist Assemblymen permanent, this would not end the matter. It would simply assume a still graver phase for our enemies and raise us to the status of a martyred movement in this country. By keeping our heads and not allowing this treachery to goad us into any conduct that would alienate sympathy, we will plant our feet upon the necks of bureaucratic upstarts in the end.

Dr. William J. Robinson

When the liberals complained that our legislators and other officials were ignorant grafters doing the bidding of political and plutocratic bosses, the answer would be:

"Why don't you educate the people to elect better men? This is a free country and everybody has a right to vote to elect whomever he chooses."

The attempt to expel the five socialist assemblymen is the most dastardly attack on representative government and peaceful evolution that has ever been made in any country in the world. Even under the Kaiser no attempt was ever made to unseat a socialist, though the openly avowed object of the socialists in Germany was a *radical* change in the government. Even the Czar of Russia dared not to attempt such tactics with the properly elected representatives in the Duma.

In Europe even when a man is actually serving a sentence in prison (and not only for a political crime, which generally is a mark of honor there, but for a common crime) if he is elected, he is liberated and permitted to take his seat. And it is right it should be so, for this is the only *logical* interpretation of representative government.

It has remained for our ignorant and corrupt politicians in Albany to belie their own boast that the majority rules in this country. The direct-actionists, the disbelievers in political action, the advocates of a violent revolution, are rejoicing.

"Didn't we tell you so?" they say. "First they will fuse, then they will do all dirty tricks to steal the votes, but if in spite of all that we will elect our representatives, they will find some dastardly way to prevent them from taking their seats."

What is your answer?

Dudley Field Malone

It is very encouraging to find that at last distinguished members of the American Bar are aroused over the suppression of fundamental American liberties which has been going on now for over two years. Nothing better could have happened than the summary exclusion of the five socialist assemblymen at Albany. I feel that this act will so shock the conscience of the average man and woman that a strong reaction will set in against the outrages which have been perpetrated by officials and courts through the last year's unwarranted hysteria.

It is good to know that members of the New York Bar at last realize that it should have been their obligation first to protest against the long continuing perversion of justice in this country.

Duncan Macdonald

(President Illinois State Fed. of Labor)

Referring to the refusal of Congress to seat Berger, I may say that with the war hysteria that has been on, they can possibly find some flimsy excuse upon which to base their decision in that case, but they do not have even a subterfuge in the case of the New York Assembly.

I am inclined to think that the party in power is setting an example that may not be lost sight of when the workers decide to join together politically, as they will have a splendid precedent to go by if they decide to put some tool of the Interests outside political office.

Lillian D. Wald

(Henry Street Settlement)

The action of the Assembly in suspending the five socialists is in my judgment a blow at the most fundamental principles of democracy, and in the judgment of numerous thoughtful people of all classes whose opinion has been expressed the protest is primarily because the action of the Assembly seems to them entirely un-American and essentially revolutionary.

Max Hayes

(Chairman Ex. Com. Labor Party)

The action of Congress in excluding Victor L. Berger and the New York legislature in barring the five socialist Assemblymen from the seats to which they were legally elected smacks of Russian practices during the reign of the Czar. In this country, where we have believed in democracy and the spirit of fair play since the Declaration of Independence was given to the world, such methods are positively childish and it is unlikely that the people will stand for such performances very long. If such practices became common, then the claim that minorities are throttled and the ballot is ineffective to adjust our domestic affairs would be verified and the theory of "direct action" would be greatly strengthened and no man living could foresee the end.

The I. S. S. Convention

While every session of the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, held in New York City on December 29th and 30th, 1919, was filled with vital discussion, the big dinner, devoted to a symposium on "The American Labor Revolt: Its Meaning," and attended by some 400 collegians, elicited, in the nature of the case, the greatest public attention. William Z. Foster, Secretary of the Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers, the chief speaker of the occasion, gripped the audience with a thrilling story of heroic sacrifice and of the developing solidarity of labor as witnessed in the steel industry. Foster first told of the organization of the meat packing industry during the war, and the beginning, on August 1, 1918, of the campaign for the unionization of the steel workers.

William Z. Foster

"I have no patience with the radical who says that nothing can be accomplished through the regular trade union movement. The fault is not with the trade unions, but with the radical. The movement is shrieking for able men and if a radical has constructive ideas, the trade unionist will pick up these ideas and put them over. I know from experience of what I am talking.

"Formerly the union organizers used to begin their work among the steel men by organizing those of one craft in one locality. Their activities would be discovered and the men in the union would be promptly discharged. This happened over and over again. I proposed to start with the organization of all crafts in all localities. If we had entered on a big campaign along these lines at that time we would have been thoroughly organized before the armistice was declared. The suggestion seemed too great a departure for the unions to make. So we employed only a few organizers and started them in the Chicago district, and the men in Gary and Indiana Harbor came in by the thousands.

"We then went to Pittsburgh. We had to fight everyone in the town. Pittsburgh is a company-owned town from top to bottom. The press, the banks, and other institutions—all are controlled by the interests, with the United States Steel Corporation the boss on the job.

"For weeks we tried to obtain permission to address peaceful meetings. We couldn't get results. Finally we decided to establish free speech ourselves. We went to McKeesport and asked the Mayor for the privilege of holding a meeting. He refused us our constitutional rights. We decided to defy the local authorities. We put up huge posters announcing the meeting, urging all who believed in sixteenth-century absolutism to stay away and those who believed in President Wilson's democracy to attend. The Mayor backed up and we held the meeting.

"We took the fight into Duquesne. We asked the Mayor for a permit to speak. Rabbi Wise was scheduled as the principal speaker. The Mayor of this town was not only mayor, but judge, one of the chief bankers, a president of the local steel mill, etc. He told us that Jesus Christ couldn't speak in Duquesne for the A. F. of L. We leased a lot, and one by one Mother Jones, another organizer, and myself were arrested as we began to speak and were fined $100 and costs. Still another organizer, hearing of the meeting, and entering the police station to pay the fines of those arrested was also hauled in.

"In those localities the deputy sheriffs, the company police, the private detectives, the city police, and the state police all coöperate against the men. Time and again workers have been arrested and fined $50 and costs for merely being found on strike!"

Mr. Foster described the commissary department of the strike committee, and declared that, instead of the strike causing the United States Steel Corporation a loss of $20,000,000, the pre-strike calculation of the

officials, it had resulted in a loss of $400,000,000. He felt that the eight-hour day would be won as a result of the strike.

The Coal Strike

Joseph D. Cannon, a member of the Executive Board of the Mining Department of the A. F. of L., declared that, during the war, the miners were granted two advances of ten cents a ton, while the operators were permitted two increases in the price of coal of $1.00 and $0.43.

"When the price of coal or eggs or sugar went up after the armistice, the administration did not think to apply the Lever Act, but when the men struck for a 60 per cent. increase in wages and a 6-hour day, the Lever Act was brought into play, and we witnessed an exhibition of the open injunction against strikes openly arrived at. This time the weapon of the injunction was used against the one organization big, powerful, and compact enough to fight. Judge Anderson's decision is destined to prove the Dred Scott decision of wage slavery."

James H. Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, declared that labor in Pennsylvania had just started a campaign to raise a million dollars for a daily labor newspaper that would print the truth and counteract the misrepresentations in the capitalistic press. He referred to the alleged strike-breaking activities of certain officials in the Department of Justice, and ridiculed the contention that the present discontent in the country was due to the work of agitators.

"To think that discontent will be stopped if a few hundred agitators are deported," he asserted, "is childish. If I was deported, I do not think that the Department of Justice would find less discontent in the state of Pennsylvania, despite the editorials in the newspapers—I mean papers."

A Rank and File Movement

Roger Baldwin, who recently spent several weeks among the steel workers and miners of the Middle West, declared that the labor revolt was a rank and file movement, and was not a movement of a few agitators. Everywhere he had sensed a growing feeling on the part of great masses of workers not connected with any revolutionary organization that the day was soon at hand when the workers would run the world. There was a growing resistance to oppression, and an increasing demand for social ownership. The steel strike, he declared, was a winning proposition. The strike-breakers in the mill were doing as little work as they could. Most of them sympathized with the union, but were afraid to go out of the mills, or were lured by the money offered.

That the Intercollegiate Socialist Society was performing a great service in this era of hysteria by spreading a genuine understanding of the activities in the world of labor and socialism among the so-called educated groups in the community, was the contention of Norman Thomas.

"Last year," he declared, "when the I. S. S. members gathered for its annual dinner, many present were in instant expectation of the spread of revolution throughout Europe. Many hoped much from the League of Nations. The year 1919 has been one of disillusionment. To be sure Soviet Russia has maintained and strengthened itself. A new spirit is abroad in the labor world. The Lusk Committee and other groups, by their bitter persecutions, have been doing for the radical movement ten times as effective propaganda work as we could have accomplished unaided. Yet we witness the foulest of all crimes, the Russian blockade. We still find hundreds of political prisoners behind the bars. We have before us the task of ridding ourselves of economic illiteracy."

The speaker stated that all of the suppressions were encouraging the spirit of violence. It was still possible, however, to make future progress a peaceful one. This could be accomplished by spreading an understanding of the movement toward industrial democracy among the educated groups, and the I. S. S. was doing effective work along that line.

James Oneal of the *New York Call* mentioned the weakening of the old labor dynasty, the struggle of the radicals for the control of the central labor bodies, the rise of the Labor Party, and the development of better understanding between various groups engaged in reconstructing the present economic order as among the hopeful signs in the labor world. Florence Kelley presided. The dinner was held in the Hotel des Artistes.

The first public gathering of the convention on Monday night, December 29th, at the Greenwich House, was devoted to a symposium on the place of the collegian in the labor and socialist movements. Florence Kelley spoke of the men of distinction who had recently resigned from American colleges in order to save their souls, and of the difficulty of professors remaining in an endowed university and keeping their self-respect. "All thinking socialists," she declared, "should insist on knowing how free is the teaching force of the colleges, and how the money of the universities is invested. Are college funds invested in such a way as to increase the power of the worst capitalists"?

Mrs. Kelley concluded by declaring that, years ago, the young often showed their rebel spirit by leaving home and going to college, but that the time may come when the true rebel will be the collegian who leaves college in protest against conditions there.

Albert De Silver, Director of the Civil Liberties Bureau, made a plea that the heretic be heard, and that the collegian fight against the hysteria of the present. "The collegian," he declared, "should aim to get a knowledge of the truth. This is possible only when there is free competition of ideas in the open market."

The Intellectual in Europe.

Several speakers dealt with the intellectual in the revolutionary movements abroad. Gregory Zilboorg, formerly secretary of the Ministry of Labor under Kerensky, told of the help rendered by the Russian university student in the maintenance of order after the March and November revolutions of 1917, and declared that it was the duty of the collegians of America to assist in creating an intellectual basis for the support of economic reconstruction in the days that are to come. He urged them to be frank with themselves and others in all of their thinking.

That the Hungarian Soviet Government, during its short career, placed much reliance on the intellectual, and paid high salaries to technical experts, school teachers and others, was the contention of Alice Riggs Hunt, recently returned from Hungary. She also mentioned the widespread suspicion abroad of the radical intellectual, and urged collegians to study hard, to know where they stand on social questions and not to hesitate to be true to their convictions.

The place of the collegian in the British labor movement—specifically in connection with the Workers' Educational Association, with the great labor newspaper, *The Daily Herald,* with the research work of the Fabian Society, with the trade union movement, and with the settlements—was emphasized by Walter G. Fuller of *The World Tomorrow.*

Helen Van B. de Kay, recently returned from France, told of the work of Romain Rolland, and the latter's belief that socialists would meet times of crisis in a more positive fashion if the movement was more permeated than at present with a deep religious passion.

Must Know the Neighborhood

Returning to the intellectual in this country, Mary Simkhovitch asserted that one could not function effectively as a leader unless he knew the American neighborhood and that the settlement was the best place in which to witness a cross-section of present-day society. Louise Adams Grout urged collegians to come into personal contact with the labor movement if they wished to understand its problems. H. W. L. Dana told in humorous vein the story of "Humphries at Harvard." W. Harris Crook made a plea for the support of *The Socialist Review,* one of the few periodicals that seeks to spread light on the international labor movement. Rev. John Darr emphasized the essentially religious character of the socialist and labor movement and deprecated class hatreds. Jessica Smith gave a vivid picture of the need of just such work as the I. S. S. is doing in arousing the youth to a realization of social conditions, while Alexander Trachtenberg described the necessity of careful research work in the radical movement. Algernon Lee, leader of the socialist group in the Board of Aldermen, the final speaker, spoke of the place of the collegian in the socialist movement. He said in part:

"The majority of American collegians come from groups in the population who think that they have something to lose by socialism, or wish after graduation to jump into the propertied classes. Nevertheless there are many who want to ally themselves with socialism. If a collegian enters the socialist movement with a sense of humor, a sense of proportion and devotion and doesn't overestimate his own importance, he can find something important to do.

"The talk against the intellectual does not generally originate with the real workingman, but from the so-called intellectual and the so-called proletariat who never works. Socialists do not entertain a distrust for formal education. If intellectuals are desirous of serving, they are welcome in the movement and can do valuable work for the cause. They should, however, serve as interpreters, as investigators, as teachers, but should not make the mistake of thinking that they know the policy the working class should pursue better than does the working class itself."

The first session of the convention was called to order at Miss Stokes' Studio, 90 Grove Street, by Florence Kelley, president of the I. S. S. Regular and fraternal delegates at this and succeeding sessions were present from Harvard, Radcliffe, Vassar, Pennsylvania, Columbia and Ohio State University, the Universities of California and Illinois, the College of the City of New York, Adelphi, Barnard, Union Theological Seminary, Syracuse, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr and Bowdoin. Secretary Laidler and Jessica Smith, the Executive Secretary, told of the year's work in the colleges, the spring trips of the secretary among the colleges of New England and the Middle West, the successful June Conference, the development of the quarterly, *The Intercollegiate Socialist,* into *The Socialist Review,* the fall trips of Wilfred Humphries to a dozen New England and New York colleges, the addresses of Langdon-Davies, Monica Ewer, Florence Kelley, Harris Crook, Leland Olds, and a host of others under the auspices of the Society, as well as of the progress of such alumni groups as those at New York, Boston, Los Angeles, etc. Miss Smith reported that, at present, I. S. S. chapters existed in Adelphi, Berkeley Divinity School, California, Cornell, Iowa, Michigan, Ohio State, Radcliffe, Simmons, Vassar and Wisconsin; that unaffiliated groups with aims similar to those of the I. S. S. chapters existed at Barnard, C. C. N. Y., Clark, Harvard, Hunter, the University of Pittsburgh, etc., and that I. S. S. chapters were in the process of formation at Amherst, Brown, Columbia, Hamline, Oregon Agricultural College, Union Theological Seminary, New York University Law, Wellesley and the University of Washington.

Jean Bangs of the University of California described the many attempts to form socialist study groups at the University of California, the meeting of the radical group at the home of the late Carleton Parker, who exercised such great influence over the thinking students, the formation of propaganda clubs, which, as a result of opposition, soon became extinct, and the emergence, this fall, of the I. S. S. chapter. The problem at the university now was that of remaining on the campus and of securing the speakers the students were desirous of hearing. Members of the club were this fall told that Upton Sinclair, Walter Thomas Mills, Austin Lewis, Scott Nearing and others would not be permitted to speak at the university, while the authorities first objected to Fremont Older. Not only the faculty, but some of the student organizations, such as the Berkeley Defense Corps, at times opposed the activities of the clubs which they failed to understand. Vera Mikol of Radcliffe stated that no obstacles had been placed in the path of the club in Boston, and that successful meetings were held during the fall with W. Harris Crook and Wilfred Humphries as speakers. The Boston Alumni Chapter had greatly helped the club during the last few months.

Grace Poole, a graduate of Syracuse, told of the attack on the I. S. S. Chapter after an address by one of the local speakers on the hypothetical question as to what would happen to Syracuse if the Soviet Government was established in America. She declared that the chancellor later took over the control of the student paper, and that it was difficult to have published in the paper anything not agreeing with the chancellor's viewpoint.

Conditions in the College of the City of New York were described by Vincent Mannino and Leo Linder. Before the war the Social Problems Club had little if any difficulty in arranging lectures. At the beginning of the war the college forbade the club from inviting André Tridon, Scott Nearing and John Reed. Last spring, Evans Clark, Norman Thomas, Harry Laidler and others were permitted to address the chapter. This fall, Felix Grendon, Harry Laidler, Algernon Lee, Gilbert Cannan, and Allan McCurdy spoke before the club. The meetings were very successful, each having an attendance of at least 200. While these speakers were permitted to address the college body, however, many others were excluded, after the list of seventy names suggested by the club had been held up for several weeks. The administration even objected to a debate on socialism between Professor Mead and Assemblyman Charles Solomon. The club has now practically come to the end of the list of liberals who received the approval of the administration, and it is a very serious question as to what the organization will do next term.

The club has been holding numerous study meetings during the last term; has completed the study of Engels' "Socialism—Utopian and Scientific," and has given over several meetings to the discussion of syndicalism, direct action, etc. The Plumb Plan will soon be taken up. These meeting are well attended and bring forth vital discussion. The club is also planning a debate on the police strike with members of the Civics Club.

Joseph Turkel of Harvard Contemporary Club described the method used in advertising the Humphries' lectures and the successful results obtained. "Nothing is impossible in the way of educational work," he maintained, "if you go about the arrangements in the right manner."

B. Berdicheff of the University of Pennsylvania told of the refusal of the authorities to permit James H. Maurer to address the students of the university, and of the exclusion of Samuel Gompers some time before. Berdicheff was of the

opinion that the time was now ripe for the development within the organization of an active, convinced group of socialists, as well as the more passive group organized for the purpose of study.

Max Lustig of Columbia described at some length the situation at Columbia, and the timidity of a number of professors who are fearful of losing their positions, particularly emphasizing the feeling of revolt on the part of the liberal professors against the inquisitions of the Board of Trustees into their personal opinions. Professor Scudder declared that the failure of professors to come out with their conclusions did not always indicate timidity. Teaching was a complex science, and the immature minds of students had to be appealed to in indirect ways.

Among others to report of activities in various groups were H. W. L. Dana of the Boston Alumni; Max Bolotin, Rolland Bradley and Frank Tannenbaum of Columbia, Edna Cers of Radcliffe, Henry Flury, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, Marion Lane of Smith (graduate), Goldfarb of Rutgers, Grace Harvey of Vassar, Annie K. Merker of Tufts Medical, Rose Genodman of Adelphi, Sophie Amson (graduate) of Barnard, Benjamin Harrison and Queen L. Shepherd of the University of Illinois, Miss Needham of Bryn Mawr, and Marian Gotze of New York University.

At the Tuesday morning session a report on "Freedom of Discussion in American Universities" was given by Secretary Laidler, followed by discussion by the delegates and others. This report will be summarized in the March issue.

The Tuesday afternoon session was devoted to the "Question Box on Socialism," led in brilliant fashion by Dr. Jessie W. Hughan. Secretary Laidler gave a brief survey of the present status of socialism in America. H. W. L.

Book Reviews

The Forerunners. (Les Précurseurs.) Romain Rolland. Paris. L'Humanité, 1919.

Perhaps after all, civilians were the great heroes of the war—men like Liebknecht, Cardinal Mercier, and Romain Rolland. When the names of generals are forgotten, these three will be remembered—the German who dared denounce his own government, the Belgian priest who did so much for his country, and the Frenchman who held the torch of Humanity safe above the battle throughout the night of the war.

"In the abyss of misery in which Europe is sinking," Rolland wrote at Christmas time, 1916, "those who wield the pen should be very scrupulous never to increase the mass of suffering nor add new reasons for hate to the burning floods of hate. Two tasks remain for the rare spirits who are free. . . . Some fearlessly attempt to open the eyes of their own peoples to their errors. . . . That is not the task I have assigned to myself. My task is to recall to the brother-enemies of Europe, not the worst in them but the best in them—reasons to hope for a wiser and more loving mankind."

That task Rolland performed in a score of scattered independent journals in a half-score countries. *Above the Battle* collected some of these essays from the first year of the war. *The Forerunners* succeeds it, but the most important part of Rolland's wartime writings, he tells us, cannot yet be published. It is a collection of "letters, conversations, spiritual confessions, that I have been receiving steadily from free and persecuted spirits in all countries. I have inscribed in it as restrainedly as possible my own reflections and my part in the combat. *Unus ex multo.* It is in a way the drama of the free consciences of the world fighting against the unrestrained forces of fanaticism, violence and untruth."

The Forerunners is dedicated "to the memory of the martyrs of the new faith—of the human Internationale. To Jean Jaurès, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Kurt Eisner, Gustav Landauer, victims of cruel stupidity and murderous untruth, liberators of the men who killed them." Most of the essays are tributes to forerunners of the world to be—to Professor Nicolai, Andreas Latzko and Stefan Zweig beyond the Rhine; *The Masses* group in America; E. D. Morel in England; Maxim Gorki—"The master of Pity and Misery," and Tolstoi; August Forel; Henri Barbusse, Marcelle Capy, Martinet, Jouve, Husson, Wullens and Delemer in France. He concludes with that magnificent declaration of the independence of the mind which Max Eastman so grievously misunderstood in the December *Liberator.*

Rolland is beyond politics and parties, but he is never indifferent or aloof. He is merely too honest to make the compromises which even the best of politics demand. His mountainside in Switzerland only brought him closer to the real heart of the world war. You look for his writings, not in the famous reviews that line the shelves of university libraries, but in the living papers of young idealists and in the socialist dailies. It is with them that he feels himself in sympathy.

Something of that courageous disillusionment which is so characteristic of the French mind and so utterly foreign to the American, marks most of Rolland's work, but like Max Eastman he supported Wilson for a time. "I am not a Wilsonian," he wrote when Wilson came to France in

1918. But he urged support of the President then "because this great bourgeois incarnates the purest, most disinterested, most humane, elements of the conscience of his class." In June, 1919, reprinting the statement in *The Forerunners,* he added a footnote: "Events have proved that that was not saying much. The moral abdication of President Wilson, abandoning his own principles without having the courage to recognize it, marks the ruin of the great bourgeois idealism which for a century and a half, despite all its faults, has assured the prestige and force of the ruling class. The consequences of such an act are incalculable."

Excursions into politics are unnatural for a man of Rolland's temper. He is concerned more deeply with the "eternal tragedy of Mankind" and those who understand it, with the meaning of youth, of freedom, of fraternity. *The Forerunners* is not a book of unmitigated hope or of ready optimism. No European can write in such a vein today. It is what is rare in Europe or America, a book of faith, disillusioned and intense.

"Man is an animal that sings," he says in introducing Stefan Zweig's dramatic poem *Jeremiah,* "He can no more live without song than without bread." So he concludes his own Hymn to Peace, written in the first year of the war:

"Like the cricket singing in the fields, the storm comes, the rain falls in torrents, it drowns the furrows and the song. But scarcely is the tumult passed—the obstinate little singer resumes.

"So when in the smoking East the furious gallop of the Four Horsemen, pounding over the ravaged earth, fades away, I raise my head and resume my song—modest and persistent."

LEWIS S. GANNETT.

A Levy on Capital. By F. W. Pethick Lawrence. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Peace hath its fiscal triumphs no less renowned than war. Two years ago the mere suggestion of a tax on capital property (a tax large enough to expunge a whole national debt) would instantly have been shouted down as confiscation. When Mr. Pethick Lawrence's book appeared a year ago, the suggestion was still "red" enough to make hearts of oak "jump out of their sockets," as Mrs. Jupp would say. Today, the capital levy is a fact in the finances of Germany and a familiar item in the practical politics of Great Britain.

The question at the heart of Mr. Pethick Lawrence's book is: How can the war be paid for without crippling productive industry or perpetuating poverty? The author confines his data to England. But the subject of his inquiry is the all-absorbing problem of the hour in every country that has not yet turned its arms into ploughshares.

The chief point in the book may be grasped by a glance at the following questions:

1. Must we assess the present generation with the *interest* of the huge war debt, leaving future generations to shoulder the *principal?*

or

2. Can we wipe out the war debt once and for all by a single levy on the national wealth, and thus avoid hanging a millstone around the neck of posterity?

Briefly answered, the first proposal is declared impracticable because its adoption would paralyze business and industry, not merely in the future, but at the present time. The second plan, though a desperate remedy, is held to be the only feasible one.

Mr. Pethick Lawrence points out that the first English peace budget will have to deal with a net State debt of 30 billion dollars. Doubled death duties and a seven and sixpenny income tax with a super-tax in proportion will have to be resorted to. Yet these measures will not be drastic enough. They will certainly not pay the interest on the debt and provide a reasonable sinking fund, much less touch the principal. Even if the Chancellor of the Exchequer attempts to meet the Government's obligations by imposing a higher and higher tax on unearned incomes, the State will none the less remain heavily indebted for generations to come. This prospect will make its citizens "anxious to emigrate in order to escape the burden of taxation, newcomers will be few, inflation will continue and prices remain high. The burden will perpetuate poverty and ingerminate slums, malnutrition and disease."

To this plan, which we may call the deferred payment plan, there are two alternatives. There is repudiation, and there is a levy of capital for the purpose of wiping out the war debt at a single blow. Mr. Lawrence summarily rejects repudiation and thus narrows the problem to a choice between two imposts, one a scheme for deferred payment, the other a scheme for immediate payment.

What are the merits of these rival imposts? It has already been pointed out that the deferred payment plan involves a tax which will pay the *interest* on the war debt, and very little more; the immediate payment plan involves a levy on capital or wealth which will pay the *principal* and be done with it. The former means a heavy annual tax that will be visited with Biblical rigor on untold generations to come; the latter means a single stupendous assessment that will annihilate the debt forthwith. The first will be a tax of a normal kind, to which national fiscal policies have already accustomed us; that is, it will be a graduated tax on incomes, earned and unearned. The second will be a tax of a new and heroic kind. It will be

a charge, not against incomes directly earned by men in their business or professions, but against investments and personal belongings that yield no income, such as motor cars, horses, carriages, jewelry, and furniture. It will, in short, be a levy on the total fixed wealth of the country. And mark the equity of its effect. It will fall most lightly on the wage-earner, lightly on the brain-worker whose capital is small, less lightly on business and professional men who have begun to accumulate wealth, and heavily only on the extremely rich.

These results are made reasonably clear in a chapter that shows the effect of the levy on the pockets of seven persons, each of whom is typical of a different class in the community. Under the scheme as the author presents it, small shopkeepers, small business men, and professional workers of limited means can actually reduce their annual taxes slightly, if they choose to pay their share of the levy annually in the form of interest. Such payments by instalments may even receive official encouragement, since the State will thereby obtain a financial interest in certain national enterprises. In Mr. Pethick Lawrence's opinion, the whole impost "will bring about partial deflation. It will not change the total aggregate of the wealth of the country as a whole, but will change its distribution. It will make it possible to balance the budget and reduce direct taxation. In this way business men with moderate incomes will find the levy much less hindrance to their business than the heavy income tax which will otherwise have to be imposed. The persons who will feel the weight of the levy most heavily will be the men of great wealth and those living without personal exertion on the proceeds of their investments."

The question remains, What will be the attitude of the very rich? Mr. Pethick Lawrence does not deny that men of great wealth will be disposed to regard the levy as an intolerable hardship, but he holds that "this hardship will be a lesser evil to the country as a whole than any other measure which might be adopted to meet the situation." He calls attention to the way in which the war enormously reinforced the pockets of the richer classes. "The aggregate increase of wealth in private hands will be no less than twelve and a half billion dollars. Speaking broadly, the distribution of wealth will be still more unequal when the war ceases than it was when it began, for the small number of rich men will retain most of what they had before, and in addition, will have added the right to participate, because of their holdings of war loan (bought largely out of profits on war contracts), in a great part of the wealth which future generations will create."

In view of this redistribution of wealth in favor of the millionaire class, no Chancellor dare now bring out a budget that does not provide for a redistribution in the opposite direction. This result is precisely what the levy on capital is to achieve by the selfsame stroke that will destroy the war debt. Mr. Lawrence calls upon the very rich "not to fight with their backs again the wall to preserve their vast hoards of wealth against the growing poverty and distress." This may sound a little like calling spirits from the vasty deep. But it must be remembered that the heaviest toll, the toll on the multi-millionaires, will result in payments not very much larger than those which the multi-millionaires are already making of their own free will. It is the multi-millionaire class which is feverishly flinging lump sums of one hundred millions into the startled laps of scientific and educational foundations and explaining its prodigality as a pious desire to escape the disgrace of dying too rich. Well, Mr. Lawrence's levy on capital is a plan warranted to wash all stains away without any further exertion on the culprit's part than is involved in making out a tax return and exchange the rôle of a donor handsomely subsidizing a private charity for that of a taxpayer, or rather a levy-payer, cheerfully performing a public duty.

Mr. Pethick Lawrence presents his case without varnish and defends it without gloves. His book is consequently very readable as well as very opportune. Let nobody think that the Capital Levy has even one leg in Utopia. The fact is that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has already formed a nodding acquaintance with it, the British Labor Party has adopted it as an important item in its program, and the Berlin Government actually has it under way, the German Capital Levy rising as high as 65 per cent. on the largest fortunes!

FELIX GRENDON.

Organizing for Work. By H. L. Gantt. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

The problems which the socialist approaches with a more or less academic bias, which the capitalist treats with worried contempt, and which the worker sees with class-conscious concern, have yet another aspect for the industrial engineer. His point of view differs from these others in that he considers both men and machines primarily as productive agencies for the whole community. He is interested in profits and wages in so far as they furnish an incentive to work. He is at once less of a social philosopher and more of a pragmatist. This may be a contradiction in terms, but an examination of the late H. L. Gantt's recent book, *Organizing for Work,* will clarify the distinction.

Mr. Gantt's study of industrial problems has been pursued in the laboratory. He was associated with F. W. Taylor at the Midvale Steel Works, and for some twenty years he has worked

at the installation of production methods in factories. During the war he was employed in a consulting capacity by such institutions as the Ordnance Department, the Shipping Board, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. His work has been of a sort that enforces hard-headed, or perhaps more truly tough-minded thinking. He has been dealing with technical problems of efficiency, and because those interested in these things are the large concerns, he has had to consider not merely the industrial, but also the business side of modern production.

Organizing for Work remains for Mr. Gantt an engineering feat. He disclaims repeatedly any revolutionary implications. This is the more curious because the first plank in his platform is as revolutionary as anything in Lenin's program. It is this: "The business system must accept its social responsibility and devote itself primarily to service, or the community will ultimately make the attempt to take it over in order to operate it in its own interest." The whole thing seems, from the engineer's viewpoint, so much a matter-of-fact that he cannot see that the elimination of special privilege which he would introduce, and the conduct of business and industry by industrial engineers rather than by financiers, in short, industrial democracy, is contrary to the historic principles of American business development.

The mechanism which Mr. Gantt favors, and which his experience has proved, seems logical enough. In the first place, he puts forward the general principle that "the indirect expense chargeable to the output of a factory should bear the same ratio to the indirect expense necessary to run the factory at normal capacity as the output in question bears to the normal output of the factory." Further, he has worked out a chart system, lucidly explained and illustrated, whereby productive capacity of both men and machines is accurately measured, and idle men and idle capital alike are shown up as inexcusable drain on the community. These charts show not only where the expense falls, but why.

His theory is attractive as only theories of practical application can be. He writes with engaging clarity and persuasiveness. In hardly more than 100 pages he presents to the layman a concise and vivid outline of what has been done and what needs to be done to put industry on a productive basis. But what stares out at the student of economic theory is that Mr. Gantt appears not to have made the primary dictinction between business and industry. Throughout the book one finds such statements as these: "The present business system . . . is absolutely sound at bottom." "The one thing in all the civilized world, which . . . crosses all frontiers and binds together all peoples, is business." The author would eliminate privilege without interfering with the current business system. This smacks somewhat of Hamlet with the Dane left out. He would put industry on a democratic basis, and make productive capacity the *sine qua non* of management, and yet not abolish private ownership. Peculiarly inconsistent seems his appreciation of the industrial foundations of the Soviet system and his panic fear that we follow in the footsteps of the Bolsheviki.

In spite of this anomaly, however, the volume represents a stimulating addition to such effective thinking as one finds in *The Instinct of Workmanship.* It offers a solution whose practicability outweighs such faults as are indicated above. It makes industrial engineering appear not so much the hope of the liberals as the advancing accomplishment of the engineers.

BABETTE DEUTSCH.

Injustice at Utica

As this journal goes to press news comes from Utica, New York, of the sentencing of Preston Hotze and Charles M. Steene to one and a half years imprisonment on the charge of distributing circulars issued by the national office of the Socialist Party on behalf of amnesty for political prisoners.

In November, 1919, Messrs. Hotze and Steene of Syracuse were asked to distribute circulars, advertising the Kirkpatrick amnesty lecture, and in addition, carrying a couple of cartoons picturing a conscientious objector with hands bound to the bars of his cell, and urging the release of political prisoners. The two defendants, neither of whom had read the circulars, were arrested on the charge of violating the provisions of the Espionage Act by bringing the uniform of a United States officer into contempt and giving comfort to the enemy. The prosecuting attorney, in arguing the case, declared that the circular must have been written by a master mind, *because one had to read between the lines to realize the seditious character of the pamphlet.*

Books Received

Gun Fodder. A. Hamilton Gibbs. Boston. Little Brown & Co. $2.00.

British Labor Conditions and Legislation During War. M. B. Hammond. Oxford University Press.

Syllabus of Background and Issues of the World War. Norman M. Trenholme. Columbia, Mo. The Missouri Book Co.

The New Social Order. Harry F. Ward. New York. Macmillan. $2.50.